

Mr. MARTIN was the possessor of a native wit that made him popular among his colleagues and he enlivened many a debate among the city fathers. He made a study of municipal affairs and was a conscientious worker for the welfare of the city.

While he was a lifelong and uncompromising Democrat, he never allowed politics to supersede the interests of all the people. He was a patriot in the truest sense of the word and his ambition was to do something for his country's benefit during his life; he was influenced by no other consideration in seeking the honor of election to this honorable body. Having been reared among the people whom he so long and so faithfully served as their representative in the legislative body of the great municipality of which he was a typical son, these people respected and had confidence in him, and those who knew him well loved him best. They took delight in honoring him, as his political record amply proves, and when he asked the last and greatest honor at their hands, a membership to this great Legislative Assembly, they cheerfully gave it to him.

When we were called into special session in April, 1917, I had the pleasure of riding with him from Chicago to Washington. It was his first trip to the National Capital as a Member of Congress. I noticed then he was not in the best of health; he had not been for some time previous. In fact, he was a sick man when he ran for the office, but he felt that he was able to and he seemed confident that he would regain his health sufficiently to serve his constituency during the term for which he was elected. It was quite apparent at the time that we could not keep out of the great and terrible war in Europe much longer; in fact, it was understood then that we were called to Washington to receive a message from the President declaring war upon Germany. Mr. MARTIN said he was determined, if such was the case, to stand by the President and our Government at all hazard. He voted for the declaration of war, but was not able to remain in Washington long after because of his failing health. He hated to leave here while his country was at war, but was compelled to return home, never to come back again.

The membership of this House had no opportunity to learn of his worth as a legislator or a man. CHARLIE MARTIN was a good citizen, an uncompromising Democrat, a loyal American, and he will be missed by the people of his district, especially by those of his ward, whom he so long and faithfully served as their alderman. His name will, for many years, be associated with those whose work in the city council contributed to the fame, prosperity, and commercial greatness of Chicago. To his widow and family and those nearest and dearest to him we extend our heartfelt sympathy. In the stockyards district, where he was one of the great plain people, and always generous and benevolent to those in need of assistance, many a tear was brought to the eyes of the poor when he passed to the great beyond. They delighted to honor him as far as was in their power, and they long will mourn his loss and always keep his name in pleasant memory.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a time-honored custom we are met to-day to pay the last tribute of respect to one of our colleagues who has joined "the innumerable caravan that moved toward the realms of death."

It is most appropriate that the House of Representatives should perpetuate this custom, for in this era public men are subjected to so much criticism and so much that is evil is attributed to their every act that it is eminently fitting for those who served by their side in public life to testify to the good they have done and to place a wreath of honorable memory upon the name of one who is no longer here to speak for himself.

CHARLES MARTIN was only a Member of this House for a very short time before the grim reaper, Death, called him from the activities of this life to that "bourne from whence no traveler returns," but in the short time he was with us, those who had the opportunity to meet and know him found a genial and kindly personality, united to a strong and forceful character, and had he lived but a few years more he would have undoubtedly left an impressive reputation as a legislator and statesman, for he had a wide grasp of all public questions and a clear discernment of the duties and obligations of his office such as few men show in their first term.

But it was not to be, and we are reminded again that in the midst of life we should be prepared for the summons that has been prepared for all of us and that may be served at any moment.

Fortunately, as we stand beside the bier of a loved one who has gone before, we hear the gentle voice that reaches us

through the centuries and bids us recall His promise in those words of never-failing cheer: "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

It is this reflection that comforts us when we contemplate the many who have left us to go to that land of shadows and find through the Valley of the Shadow of Death the way to the Realms of Everlasting Peace.

It is then, as we recall the losses we have suffered in the past, that we may say with the poet:

Life's shores are shifting
Every year,
And we are seaward drifting
Every year,
Old places, changing, fret us;
The living more forget us;
There are fewer to regret us
Every year;
But the truer life grows nigher
Every year;
Earth's hold on us grows slighter
And the heavy burden lighter
And the dawn immortal brighter,
Every year.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues I am here to-day to pay tribute to the memory of our departed colleague, CHARLES MARTIN, whom I have known intimately and well for over 30 years.

CHARLES MARTIN was a plain, blunt, fearless, and courageous man. I served with him for many years on the county central committee, as well as on the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Cook County, Ill., and I at all times admired and appreciated his earnest determination to aid and be of service to the party which he at all times designated the party of the people.

As has been so well stated by my colleagues, Messrs. GALLAGHER and RAINEY, he was a strong and courageous man, never hesitating to do what he believed was right. He was a strong speaker and debater, and was known to express his views in a manner that could never be misunderstood by anyone. He was indeed a born fighter for the cause of democracy and those things which he advocated and believed in. He was a unique man; he had his peculiarities, and, being human and the same as we, suffered with some imperfections. Who does not?

During his many years of service, due to his fighting proclivities, he brought upon himself many political contests. He had a large personal following and many warm friends who at all times stood loyally by him, which made it possible for him to combat strong opposition and thus show his ability to come back again and again into public life. He did a great deal for Chicago, especially in the interest of the people of his district and his ward. After many years of service in the common council it was his aim to be elected from his district as Representative in Congress, in which he was successful in 1916 in a bitter primary fight, being elected by a tremendous majority on election day. Soon after the election he was stricken by illness, from which he never recovered. Notwithstanding his serious illness, when the Sixty-fifth Congress convened, believing that his presence was necessary to bring about the reelection of a Democrat as Speaker and the organization of the House, he disregarded the advice of his physician and family, left a sanitarium, and came to the Capitol to assume his congressional duties. Here I had still better opportunity during the short space of time which it was his good fortune to serve to learn to admire his determination and his immense loyalty and love for his country, and it is to be regretted that he was not spared so that he could have demonstrated to his district and his many friends in Chicago that he was not only a capable councilman, but that he was a capable, faithful, and loyal legislator. Realizing and recognizing his physical condition, I advised, together with other colleagues, that he should not remain much longer without proper care and attention, and though he himself realized his serious condition he insisted on remaining and did remain nearly to the last, so that he could vote on some of the measures which he believed required his vote, remarking in his usual unique way, "There is not much more that I can do, so will stay as long as I can." But, notwithstanding his will power and determination, he was obliged to leave Washington shortly after his congressional duties began, never again to return. Within a few short days he departed whence no traveler returns.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, in accordance with the resolution heretofore adopted, the House (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 3, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the God of our fathers, we worship Thee. We seek Thy guidance and blessing as we attempt the duties of this day. As Thou hast led us in times past, so we trust Thee to lead us on. By meditation upon Thy name we gain the vision of the things to be done, the balance of right and justice, the high ideals, the principles upon which we are to build our national life. Let us have Thy presence and blessing this day in the discharge of every duty. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, January 31, 1919, when, on request of Mr. KING and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS (H. DOC. NO. 1754).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers and documents on file in the Department of the Interior having no historical value, and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House thereof.

POSTAGE TO POSTAL UNION COUNTRIES (S. DOC. NO. 366).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$250 required by the War Department for postage to postal union countries for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS (H. DOC. NO. 1746).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a list of 156 buildings and 7 extensions of Federal buildings which have been authorized by Congress but have not so far been constructed, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of War (S. Doc. No. 368), the Secretary of the Navy (S. Doc. No. 373), the Secretary of Agriculture (S. Doc. No. 370), the Postmaster General (S. Doc. No. 367), the Attorney General (S. Doc. No. 371), the Chairman of the War Trade Board (S. Doc. No. 369), and the Chairman of the United States Shipping Board (S. Doc. No. 372), transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civilian employees in their respective departments of January 28 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which, with the accompanying papers, were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1749).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Gas Light Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1750).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CAPITAL TRACTION CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1747).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON HEIGHTS TRACTION CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1748).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Heights Traction Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1751).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CITY & SUBURBAN RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri, ratifying the proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 15018. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. R. 15219. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Management of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE, late a Senator from the State of Missouri.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. CHARLES MARTIN, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JACOB E. MEEKER, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 13004. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge and for the maintenance of a pontoon and pile bridge by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. across the Missouri River at or near Chamberlain, S. Dak., and providing additional requirements for the bridge to be constructed; and

H. R. 13143. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., or for the construction of a tunnel or tunnels under said river in lieu of said bridge.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois, petitioning Congress to pay at least six months' salary to every soldier, sailor, and marine upon his return to civil life, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois, petitioning Congress to pass the woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Port Huron, Mich., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Father Mathew Total Abstinence Society, of Salem, Mass., praying for the freedom of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the congregations of the Protestant churches of Melrose, Mass., and a petition of the congregation of the Trinitarian Congregational Church, of Northfield, Mass., praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CALDER. I present a resolution adopted at a meeting of the New York Produce Exchange with reference to the cost of food. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a special meeting of the board of managers of the New York Produce Exchange, held January 30, 1919, the following preamble and resolution were adopted:

"Whereas it is evident that a readjustment from war conditions is inevitable, and is in fact now proceeding in industry and commerce; and

"Whereas we believe that a material reduction in cost of living is absolutely essential to the successful reorganization and adjustment of the country's economic and social life; and

"Whereas it is evident that a reduction in price of the great food staples is the first and most vital factor in bringing about lower living costs, which must take place to meet a probable reduction in wages in the manufacturing and industrial life of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the policy of this exchange is against any further Government price fixing or control of foodstuffs beyond the point of a just and equitable adjustment of existing Government obligations, in which consideration should be given to the rights of all classes, both producers and consumers, and that the exchange hereby empowers its officers or other authorized representatives to assist in any necessary constructive work, legal or otherwise, to hasten the return of business to its normal channels."

Mr. MOSES. I present a resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, N. H., in relation to the Government control of the telephone and telegraph systems, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed by the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, Manchester, N. H., January 31, 1919:

Whereas the remarkably difficult problems resulting from the war and the coming period of business readjustment render it exceedingly difficult, if not wholly impossible, for the owners of the great telephone and telegraph systems now under Federal control to successfully resume the operation of the same without remedial legislation and the provision of some reasonable period in which to allow for the necessary preparation and readjustment; and

Whereas to properly consider these problems in all their intricacies will require much more time than is available in the present short session of Congress, and unless some action is taken at this time the properties will be returned to the companies owning them upon the proclamation by the President of the ratification of peace treaties without any advance notice being given and without any period for proper and necessary readjustment, and since such a period of readjustment is of exceedingly vital importance to the business interests of the Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this organization go on record as favoring the enactment by Congress of some law which will continue the control and operation of such utilities by the Government until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators of this State and to the Representative in Congress of this district.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the resolution as passed.

C. W. PATMAN,

Secretary Manchester Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE,
1919 SESSION.

Mr. Dilley offers the following resolution:

Whereas now that the military forces of this country and its allies are victorious retention of the Voluntary Army seems unnecessary and action should be taken to demobilize it without delay so that its soldiers and sailors may be returned to their peaceful vocations and that there be substituted a Regular Army so increased as to properly protect our interests abroad in accordance with the plans of the President and military board: And be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives is hereby instructed to send to the President, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota a copy of this resolution.

W. I. NOLAN, Speaker.

Adopted January 27, 1918.

Attest:

OSCAR ARNESON, Chief Clerk.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to

have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE,
1919 SESSION.

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant a gratuity of three months' pay to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Whereas since the signing of the armistice the soldiers, sailors, and marines, who rendered such valliant service at home and abroad for their country in its hour of trial in the great war from which this country has emerged gloriously, are now being demobilized and discharged with greater rapidity than admits of their assimilation into the industries of civil life; and

Whereas all these valliant boys have been serving at rates of pay sufficient only for their needs from day to day, making no provision for the immediate future or for tiding them over the weeks and months of idleness which in most cases must follow the release of millions of men in a Nation whose industries are now stagnant and awaiting the readjustment from a war to a peace basis; and

Whereas unless relief is granted by appropriate legislation, these boys, the pride of our country, the savior of our liberties, and the protectors of our homes and free institutions, must be called upon or allowed to suffer privations which would warrant them in reaching the conclusion that, after all, the statement is true that "Republics are ungrateful" and that protection for those valliant heroes was forthcoming so long only as their service on the firing line was needed to protect those at home in person and property: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently request and earnestly urge that the Congress of the United States provide at this time by suitable enactment into law that all heretofore and hereafter honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States in the great world war be granted and paid a gratuity equal to three months' pay after the date of their respective discharges at the same rate applicable to each such soldier, sailor, and marine at the date of his discharge, the same to be paid monthly through such channels as Congress may direct.

Resolved further, That this resolution, the senate concurring, be duly recorded in the records of this session, and that copies thereof be forthwith forwarded to each of the Senators in Congress from Minnesota and to each Member of the National House of Representatives from Minnesota, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretaries of War and Navy of the United States.

W. I. NOLAN, Speaker.

Adopted January 29, 1919.

Attest:

OSCAR ARNESON, Chief Clerk.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE,
1919 SESSION.

Messrs. John Frisch and O. E. Hammer offer the following resolution:

Whereas a bill to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military service of the United States, known as Senate bill 2130, introduced by Senator KNUTE NELSON, is now pending in our National Congress; and

Whereas we believe that the provisions of said bill will, if made a law, in a measure relieve the financial stress of those who have received permanent injuries in the wars in which this country has been engaged: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota hereby gives its indorsement to the provisions of said bill and urges all our Senators and Representatives in Congress to do all in their power to gain the enactment of the same into law.

W. I. NOLAN, Speaker.

Adopted January 27, 1919.

Attest:

OSCAR ARNESON, Chief Clerk.

Mr. NELSON. I present a telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., February 1, 1919.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was passed by Minnesota House and Senate and signed by the governor and should have gone to the United States Senate January 23, but we have message saying that it is not yet received. May we ask you to have it read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at once? Resolution follows:

"To the United States Senate:

"Whereas nearly a half century ago the progressive spirit of American democracy decreed in the Federal Constitution that the rights of citizens of the United States to vote should not be denied by any State on account of race or color; and

"Whereas more than half of the citizens of voting age of more than two-thirds of the States of our Nation are denied the right to vote solely because they are women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That we earnestly and urgently petition your honorable body to join with the House of Representatives in its action in proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that the right of any woman to vote shall not be denied by any State solely because she is a woman.

"That a copy of this resolution with the names of those who vote for the same be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to each Senator and Representative from Minnesota."

Mrs. ANDREUS UELAND.

Mr. NELSON presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Joseph Wilde, of Duluth, Minn., and a telegram in the nature of a petition from Charles Jones, of Duluth, Minn., praying that special clerks in the Postal Service be included in the salary increase, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Board of Trade of Duluth, Minn., praying for the return to private ownership of the telegraph and telephone systems of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local Council No. 397, Knights of Columbus, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring freedom for Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a measure known as the educational bill, S. 4987, which is the most comprehensive and important educational bill that has ever been considered by that body; and

Whereas this bill has for its purpose the removal of illiteracy, the Americanization of immigrants, the promoting of physical and health education, the improving of facilities for the preparation of teachers, and the creation of a national department of education; and

Whereas Oregon's share of the Federal appropriation provided in this bill for the public schools amounts to \$857,587.67 annually: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be memorialized and urged to use all honorable means to secure the enactment of the educational bill, S. 4987.

Adopted by the house January 28, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 21, 1919.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 5.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), respectfully represent this: That—

Whereas Congressman SINNOTT, of the third congressional district of the State of Oregon, has introduced a bill which is now pending in the Congress of the United States having for its purpose, among other things, the appropriating of \$1,000,000,000 for reclamation and drainage of lands in the western portion of the United States; and

Whereas passage of the bill would insure Federal aid for the development of the Dechutes project, comprising an area of approximately 300,000 acres in the State of Oregon, and other projects within the State; and

Whereas any such construction and development would provide work and employment for thousands of returning soldiers and sailors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), That the Representative Assembly of the State of Oregon favor the passage by Congress of the said Sinnott bill, and to that end the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the United States from the State of Oregon are hereby urged to use their influence in behalf of the passage of said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the senate, January 22, 1919.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 20, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that house joint memorial No. 5 is a true copy as passed by the house and senate as above indicated.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 4.

Whereas the Umatilla River Irrigation League has presented plans to the United States Reclamation Service for the development of arid lands in the lower Umatilla River Basin; and

Whereas the Director of the Reclamation Service ordered a survey and investigation of said proposed irrigation project, which has been made and the plan for reclaiming said lands has been pronounced feasible, and the cost of reclamation, quality of soil, uniform topography, climatic conditions, facilities for transportation and marketing have been found highly desirable for the easy establishment of farms for soldiers; and

Whereas all that now delays construction on said project is want of Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be memorialized to use their influence in Congress to secure the necessary appropriation; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress urge upon Congress the immediate importance of passing the Sinnott bill calling for \$1,000,000,000 for reconstruction work, which has been indorsed by Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, and that a copy of this memorial be transmitted to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Director of the Reclamation Service and to the Secretary of the Interior.

Adopted by the senate January 23, 1919.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 21, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that the foregoing house joint memorial No. 4 is a true copy as passed by the house and senate as above indicated.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 6.

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas Crater Lake National Park, in southern Oregon, is becoming one of the great tourist attractions of the world, with a rapidly increasing list of visitors each succeeding season; and

Whereas the natural topography of the country adjacent to said park is of such nature that this park, to serve its purpose as a great natural scenic attraction and outdoor playground, should be extended to include additional territory, as provided in Senate bill No. 4283, now before Congress; and

Whereas the country so to be included within said park under the provisions of said bill is not of particular value as grazing land, timberland, or for any purposes other than the natural and proper rounding out of the said national park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon heartily favor the enactment by Congress of Senate bill No. 4283, and to that end the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon are hereby urged to use their influence in behalf of the passage of said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the Oregon Legislative Assembly be, and hereby is, directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of the Congress of the United States and to each of the Senators and the Representatives from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the senate January 27, 1919.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 21, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that the foregoing house joint memorial No. 6 is a true copy as passed by the house and senate as above indicated.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 8.

To the honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 5001, introduced on October 21, 1918, by Hon. WILLIAM H. KING, which provides for the establishing in the Department of Labor of a bureau of citizenship and Americanization, for the Americanization of naturalized citizens, and for the amendment of the act of Congress approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," and which bill was referred to the Committee on Immigration; and

Whereas said Senate bill 5001 provides for the issuance of a distinctive certificate of United States citizenship to wives and children of naturalized citizens, which certificates are to be issued only after the candidates for such certificates have passed such preliminary examinations as will evidence their attachment to the principles of the

Constitution of the United States and have appeared in open court and taken the oath of allegiance required by the naturalization law; and

Whereas the enactment and carrying out of the provisions of said Senate bill No. 5001 will result in arousing a higher regard and attachment to our institutions of Government, and in a stronger loyalty being shown to the United States on the part of all permanent resident foreigners, candidates for naturalization, and citizens, and will insure the maintenance of that high standard of admission to the privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship so essential to the perpetuation of our democratic form of government; and

Whereas the State of Oregon, having given to women the right to the franchise, it concerns the welfare of the State to provide intelligent exercise of that right and instruction in the rights and duties of citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house, the senate concurring, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and the entire Congress of the United States, be, and are hereby, memorialized and requested to immediately take up and pass said Senate bill 5001.

Resolved further, That the chief clerk of the house is hereby directed to transmit certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the senate January 28, 1919.

Adopted by the house January 23, 1919.

I hereby certify that house joint memorial 8 is a true copy as passed by the house and senate, as above indicated.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines be deferred until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon the proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LEWIS. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois, asking that the woman-suffrage resolution before this body be immediately acted upon—that is, the constitutional amendment—which I ask to have appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certificate No. 3226.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 7 of the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 31st day of January, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

FIFTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Senate joint resolution 7.

Whereas the proposed woman-suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution has been for 40 years before the Congress of the United States and has during this session of Congress received a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives but has been delayed in the United States Senate; and

Whereas the character and achievements of the women of the United States merit the same honorable suffrage recognition received by women in many other countries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we urge the United States Senate to immediately pass the Federal woman-suffrage amendment, so that it may be ratified by the legislatures of the 36 States, as provided by article 5 of the United States Constitution.

Adopted by the senate January 28, 1919.

JOHN G. OGLESBY,
President of Senate.
J. H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives January 29, 1919.

DAVID E. SHANAHAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Filed January 31, 1919.

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. LEWIS. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois as to the matter of six months' pay for soldiers, sailors, and marines, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certificate No. 3215.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of

senate joint resolution No. 6 of the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 31st day of January, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.
FIFTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Senate joint resolution 6.

Whereas the most important problem of reconstruction is the individual readjustment in the lives of the men who willingly went forth to heroically serve our Nation and our allies in the time when free institutions and the rights of free men everywhere were threatened; and Whereas no adequate provision is being made by the Federal Government for these returning soldiers, sailors, and marines who have made tremendous sacrifices for our country; and

Whereas there is a movement to secure national legislation guaranteeing to every soldier, sailor, and marine his pay for some sufficient period after his return to civil life, until he can obtain remunerative employment; and

Whereas other countries which have suffered more and which have expended far greater sums of money than has the United States of America, are making more ample and more just provisions for their soldiers: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That a memorial be sent to Congress requesting the Federal Government to pay at least six months' salary to every soldier, sailor, and marine upon his return to civil life; and be it

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the United States Senate and to the House of Representatives and to the several Members of both bodies representing the State of Illinois, and to Hon. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, and to Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy.

Adopted by the senate January 28, 1919.

JOHN G. OGLESBY,
President of Senate.
J. H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives January 29, 1919.

DAVID E. SHANAHAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Filed January 31, 1919

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, touching the pending water-power bill. It is short and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, January 27, 1919.

By Mr. Mackrell:

Whereas a bill entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of the dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910," and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of the interstate and foreign commerce, passed the Senate December 14, 1917, and the House of Representatives September 5, 1918; and

Whereas Hon. JOHN K. SHIELDS, Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, Hon. HENRY L. MYERS, Hon. KEY PITTMAN, Hon. KNUTE NELSON, and Hon. REED SMOOT, from the Senate, and Hon. THURUS W. SIMS, Hon. SCOTT FERRIS, Hon. ASBURY F. LEVER, Hon. JOHN J. ESCH, Hon. WILLIAM L. LA FOLLETTE, and Hon. GILBERT N. HAUGEN, from the House of Representatives, have been appointed to confer and agree upon the terms of said bill; and

Whereas the water powers of the State are urgently needed for the promotion of industry:

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York earnestly request our Representatives in Congress and the conferees named to do all in their power to stimulate action on said bill to the end that it may be acted upon favorably: *Providing, however,* That the same does not in any way diminish or impair the rights of the State of New York in the ownership and control of such navigable waters.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, our Representatives in Senate and in the House, as well as the conferees named above.

By order of the senate.

ERNEST A. FAY, Clerk.
IN ASSEMBLY, January 30, 1919.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

Endorsed: Filed January 30, 1919.

FRED W. HAMMOND, Clerk.

FRANCIS M. HUGO,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

Office of the Secretary of State, ss:

I have compared the preceding copy of resolution relative to regulating the construction of the dams across navigable waters and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the use of the interstate and foreign commerce with the original resolution on file in this office, and do hereby certify that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the seal of office of the secretary of state, at the city of Albany, this 30th day of January, 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. W. TAFT,
Second Deputy Secretary of State.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to have printed in the RECORD a resolution from the president of the Wisconsin Woman Suffrage

Association, reporting the action of the legislature upon a resolution regarding the enactment of the constitutional amendment now pending in the Senate. I have not yet received the resolution from the legislature, but I presume it will be forthcoming.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., February 1, 1919.

Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution passed by Wisconsin Legislature January 16—senate, 24 for, 4 against; assembly, 75 for, 14 against:

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we indorse woman suffrage, following the platforms of the political parties of this State and favor that the Senate of the United States adopt the legislation now pending before it providing for submitting to the several States an amendment to the Federal Constitution establishing national woman suffrage. Be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution, properly signed and attested by the officers of this legislature, be forwarded to the United States Senate and a copy thereof to each United States Senator."

THEODORA W. YOUNANS,
President Wisconsin Woman Suffrage Association.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of the Rotary Club, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., praying for the change of the name of the Panama Canal to Roosevelt Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of the Chartiers Grange of Farmers, of Canonsburg, Pa., praying for an adequate construction of national highways, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, of the Board of Trade of Monroeville, of the Chamber of Commerce of Lebanon, of the Rotary Club of Wilkes-Barre, of the Board of Trade of Lansdale, of the Rotary Club of Allentown, of the Kiwanis Club of Scranton, and of the Business Men's Association of Charleroi, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that the return to private ownership of telegraph and telephone lines be deferred until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon the proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 138, United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Laborers, of York; of Local Lodge No. 632, International Association of Machinists, of Reading; of Local Lodge No. 922, Brotherhood of Railway Conductors of America, of Sunbury; and of sundry members of the American Federation of Railroad Workers of the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Co., of Pottsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local Division No. 16, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Scranton, Pa., favoring freedom for Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois, petitioning Congress to pass the woman-suffrage amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois, petitioning Congress to pay at least six months' salary to every soldier, sailor, and marine upon his return to civil life, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13273) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917, reported it without amendment.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce I desire to present a report and I ask that it may be considered. It is the unanimous report of the committee, and it is a short bill. I think it is a matter which expresses the views of the Senate. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 5292) making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account, and I submit a report (No. 680) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. RANDELL. I understand the chairman of the committee wishes to have the bill go to the calendar. I have no objection to it; I voted for it in committee and would like to

have it passed, but in the absence of the chairman of the committee I ask that it may go to the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not know that the chairman might desire to have it go to the calendar.

Mr. RANDELL. It may be that he will withdraw his objection. I do not want to be considered as opposing it; I am in favor of it personally, I will state to the Senator; but I think the chairman wanted to have it go to the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; I will just present the report and let the bill go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. RANDELL. From the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 1597) to provide a division of tuberculosis in and an advisory council for the United States Public Health Service, and I submit a report (No. 681) thereon. I should like very much to have the bill taken up at once, if there be no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the bill go to the calendar in regular order.

Mr. RANDELL. All right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

HOSPITALS FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, on the 28th of last month the bill (H. R. 13026) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, after passing the House, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. On the 15th of December last a bill almost identical in terms was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine. On the 11th of December last a bill, H. R. 12917, after passing the House, was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine. It related to the same subject as Senate bill 5202, just mentioned, and House bill 13026, just mentioned.

So there are two committees now which have the same matter before them. In addition thereto the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, under a resolution passed some time ago, has for several weeks been investigating the question of hospital facilities. That measure is now being carefully investigated by the committee.

I will state, as chairman of the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, that I have discussed this rather troublesome problem with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and with several members of my committee, and the consensus of opinion of them, in which I concur, is that these bills which are now before the Appropriations Committee and the Public Health Committee should be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, so that after making a careful investigation they can determine whether or not additional hospital facilities are needed.

I ask that House bill 12917, referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, Senate bill 5202, referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, and House bill 13026, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, be sent to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I will state that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations believes that this is a wise course, and I also believe so, after a thorough investigation.

Mr. SMOOT. Can the Senator tell the Senate what committee in the House of Representatives had the bill?

Mr. RANDELL. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has been handling it over there, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate has been making rather an elaborate investigation. I have concluded that it is best to have them go ahead with it and determine whether or not these additional hospital facilities are needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. KING. I was about to ask the Senator if these bills ought not to go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RANDELL. There is no military question involved. I will state that it is for soldiers and sailors who have been discharged from the military and naval service, and there is a question as to whether or not they can be taken care of in the military hospitals under proper provision or whether we must provide additional hospital facilities to take care of them after they are discharged from the Army or the Navy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know whether the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ordinarily has jurisdiction over the hospitals and the sanitariums of the country?

Mr. RANDELL. I can not state what is the ordinary rule. I would naturally assume that the Public Health Committee would have that jurisdiction, but I will say to the Senator that in the House of Representatives the jurisdiction was assumed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and these bills have gone through there without any objection. Careful investigations were made as to both these bills, and both passed the House on the initiative of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of that body. Contemporaneous with that, I will say that a resolution was introduced into this body instructing our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to make an investigation, which is absolutely essential, to determine whether or not additional hospitals are needed, and they are now making that investigation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is the reason why I am asking the Senator whether this committee has had jurisdiction over hospitals and sanitoriums in the past. I have the impression that that is not the case, that the hospitals have not been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The action of the House is not necessarily a guide, because the jurisdiction of the committees of the Senate does not concur with the jurisdiction of the committees of the House.

Mr. RANDELL. I can not answer the question of the Senator. I will state that one of these bills, the bill carrying an appropriation of \$10,500,000 for additional hospitals, after passing the House on the 27th of last month, when it reached this body, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and not to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state what that appropriation was for?

Mr. RANDELL. It was to construct hospitals for discharged soldiers and sailors and to place those hospitals in charge of the Public Health Service.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It seems to me rather strange that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should have jurisdiction over a matter which ought to belong to the Committee on Military Affairs or to the committee having charge of Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. RANDELL. It is hardly a matter that belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs, I will say, because this is to take care of men who have been discharged from the Army or the Navy. As long as they remain in the Army or the Navy they are cared for by the military or naval hospitals. It is for the discharged men, I will say, that we are trying to provide. They come in under the war-risk insurance.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that we already have in this country, and have had for a great many years, hospitals in which discharged men are accepted as patients. Under whose jurisdiction are those hospitals?

Mr. RANDELL. They are under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, but whether the law governing the buildings was provided by the Public Health Committee or provided by the Public Buildings Committee I can not say. I know as a general rule in the 20 years since I have been in Congress public buildings have been provided for by the Public Buildings Committees of the two Houses. This is simply a question whether we need additional buildings, and I rather think the bills ought to go to that committee.

I will say to the Senator that I try to stand up for my committee whenever I think I am right, and I would insist upon that course if I believed the bills belonged properly to the Public Health Committee, but after carefully investigating it rather seems to me, and several members of the committee concur with me in that view, as it is merely a question of buildings, that the bills should go to the Public Buildings Committee.

Mr. SWANSON. The present chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], is not present. However, I am still a member of that committee. I should like to state in this connection that the reason why I presume this matter was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was because of the fact that there are temporary buildings being constructed, and that committee, I understand, is making an investigation to see if the present buildings that have been constructed during the war period can not be utilized for this purpose. As that committee has jurisdiction over public buildings generally and the necessity for them, it seems to me a wise and sensible course to pursue to have an investigation, to see if the temporary buildings constructed during the war can not be used temporarily for hospital purposes, and not go to the great expense of constructing additional buildings.

I understand that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is now investigating the temporary buildings constructed both here and elsewhere to ascertain if those buildings

can not be utilized for hospital purposes to take care of soldiers and sailors at present. It seems to me it would be a waste of money to proceed to the construction of new buildings before we ascertain whether these temporary buildings can be so used. For that purpose the question was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to ascertain the number of buildings already constructed and what use can be made of them, and to what extent they can be used for hospital purposes to take care of discharged soldiers and sailors. I understand that the committee is now making a thorough investigation, and when they have made that investigation and furnished the Senate with the information it can act intelligently with a view to the public interest.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, if they find, as a result of their investigation, that these additional buildings for hospitals are needed, the whole question will then be before them; the three bills will be before them, so that they can act intelligently, and we may get the needed legislation at this session of Congress; whereas, if we stand upon the rights of the respective committees here, a great deal of delay may result and the soldiers and sailors may suffer. I think it will expedite legislation to have this done, and I hope it will be done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice in reading the bill that it not only proposes to appropriate \$10,500,000 for the building of new hospitals or sanitoriums, but there is an authorization in the bill giving power to the Secretary of the Treasury "to contract with any existing hospital or sanatorium, by lease or otherwise, for the immediate use, in whole or in part, of their present facilities."

The bill goes on and states that they can transfer whatever equipment or material is in the present hospitals and sanitoriums to wherever they decide to erect this building.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is rather an unusual provision; and I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana if, after the discussion that took place in the House, he has formed any opinion as to what is back of this legislation; where the hospital is to be located and what is the program?

Mr. RANDELL. To what bill does the Senator from Utah refer—to the bill proposing to appropriate \$10,500,000?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I refer to that bill.

Mr. RANDELL. I do not know what is back of it, except that the hearings before the Public Health Committee indicated that there was a genuine need for additional hospitals; that a great many tuberculous patients had developed among the boys who had been sent to training camps; a great many of them, after being temporarily accepted, were discharged because of having tuberculosis, and there has been a very great increase of tuberculosis among the boys in the Army. The Public Health Service, having to take care of these men under the provisions of the war-risk insurance act, finds itself without sufficient hospitals, and they are asking that they be given additional hospitals so as to provide amply for these men. That is all I know about it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I remember correctly—and I am only quoting from memory, for I have not looked the matter up lately—out of the first one million one hundred thousand and some odd soldiers who were either drafted or entered voluntarily into the Army, there were 145,000 affected by tuberculosis. Of course, they were not allowed to enter the Army. It is true that since the Army has been organized many cases of tuberculosis have developed during the service of the soldiers. I have not seen any of the figures stating how many or what the percentage is.

Mr. RANDELL. About 22,000, I would say, were the figures given the Committee on Public Health. The men of the character of which the Senator speaks are entitled to be cared for under the provisions of their contract with the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. I had thought about that. Mr. President, of course, I am not going into a discussion of this subject at this time, but I had been led to believe, from some statements of Members of the other House, who had made an investigation into this matter, that there is a program on foot to locate somewhere in the United States a great sanatorium, and to abolish the others which are now in existence. I am also informed that the space in existing hospitals and sanitoriums is a great deal more, and can take care of a greater number of soldiers and sailors than will the proposed new hospital, but that it is intended to abandon these hospitals and sanitoriums and to concentrate them in one place.

Mr. RANDELL. I will state to the Senator that his information is incorrect in that respect. It is not intended to spend all of this money in one hospital; in fact, the Public Health Service is opposed to having very large hospitals. They say that such patients can be better treated in a number of

smaller hospitals. They have, as I understand, now some 1,500 beds scattered around in several hospitals throughout the country. They propose in some instances to enlarge some of the hospital facilities that now exist, merely increasing the size and number of the beds, and to establish some new hospitals. They are obliged under the present law to take care of the men of the merchant marine, and they anticipate a very great increase in the merchant marine, so that perhaps, in the near future, they will have a good many more men of that kind to take care of.

Now, as to the hospital of which the Senator from Utah speaks, I will state that in one of these bills, when it was introduced in the other House, there was, I believe, a special provision to construct a hospital at Dawson Springs, Ky.; but that was in the bill carrying an appropriation for, as I recall it, about \$1,500,000. That was entirely stricken out of the bill, and, as it passed the House, there is nothing of that kind in it. Probably the Public Health Service would construct a hospital at that place if it were found the best place for it. The larger bill, carrying \$10,500,000, I will say, has absolutely no connection with the bill I have just mentioned, and that is the bill which the Public Health Service is so very solicitous about.

Mr. NELSON and Mr. VARDAMAN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield further; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RANDELL. I will yield first to the Senator from Minnesota when the Senator from Utah has finished his question, and then I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SMOOT. I have finished.

Mr. NELSON. I want to ask this question: Is there not a pretty fair hospital arrangement at each of the cantonments we already have, and can not the hospitals in those cantonments be utilized to meet the necessities of the Government without incurring any great additional expense?

Mr. RANDELL. That is the very question, I will state to the Senator from Minnesota, which is now being very carefully investigated by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; and it is for that purpose that I am so willing to have the jurisdiction of the matter referred to that committee, as it has the whole subject before it, and I believe is disposed to do absolutely what is right and proper in the premises.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana if he does not think it would be better, in fact if it is not necessary, to locate the hospitals where tubercular patients are to be treated at some particular place where the atmosphere and climate is peculiarly favorable to the treatment of tuberculosis? It was a theory long entertained by the physicians that the climate of New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, and other sections of greater altitude was better. I apprehend that a hospital situated in the low malarious regions would not be quite so well suited to the treatment of tubercular patients as at the places just mentioned.

Mr. RANDELL. Responding to the question of the Senator from Mississippi, I will say that the best opinion in the medical world now is that tuberculosis can be treated about as well in one section of the country as it can be in another, and physicians do not any longer think that they are obliged to send such patients out to high altitudes in the far West, as they once used to do. I do not think that it is contemplated constructing these hospitals very far away from the centers of population.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do they keep tubercular patients in the same hospital with those who have other diseases?

Mr. RANDELL. I understand that they try to segregate them as well as they can in the wards of the hospitals; but they do not contemplate the erection of hospitals particularly for the treatment of tuberculosis.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think, Mr. President—though, of course, I am not a doctor—

Mr. RANDELL. Nor am I.

Mr. VARDAMAN. But it seems to me that the treatment of tuberculosis is so different from the treatment of other diseases that it would be very much better if the tuberculosis hospital should be situated and constructed with a view especially to the treatment of that particular disease. I know that the modern treatment of tuberculosis is open air, nutritious diet, and moderate exercise. The open-air treatment is observed in influenza and many other diseases, but it is peculiarly so in tuberculosis; but it seems to me that the tubercular patients ought to be segregated and the hospitals designed and constructed with a view of so separating the patients from others, if possible, as to avoid the possibility of contagion.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that it might be well to call attention to the obligations upon the Public Health Service? Under the law as it stands now the Public Health Service is obliged to treat the following cases:

- (1) Merchant seamen.
- (2) The Mississippi River Commission.
- (3) The United States Coast Guard Service.
- (4) The United States Lighthouse Service.
- (5) The Engineer Corps of the United States Army.
- (6) The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.
- (7) Civilian employees injured under the workman's compensation act.
- (8) Civilian employees injured on Army transports.
- (9) Cases of discharged soldiers and sailors under the war-risk insurance act of October 6, 1917.

That is quite an extensive service. The report of the House committee shows that to meet these requirements the Public Health Service has the following facilities:

Twenty-two hospitals and one sanatorium, with a total capacity of 1,556 beds. This total will be increased by 744 additional beds authorized by a provision in the urgent deficiency act approved March 28, 1918. But even when these additional beds are ready they will be inadequate to meet the needs of the Public Health Service, exclusive of the requirements of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. At the present time the Public Health Service is obliged to find accommodations for some of its charges at private hospitals.

I also quote the following from the House committee report to show the burdens and responsibilities the Public Health Service is called upon to meet:

With these inadequate facilities it is called upon to meet the following burdens and responsibilities:

War-risk insurance beneficiaries now actually under treatment—	1,539
Soldiers, sailors, and marines discharged up to Nov. 1, 1918, because of tuberculosis who are entitled to treatment under the act of Oct. 6, 1917—	23,000
Cases of epilepsy reported up to Dec. 1, 1918—	5,220
Cases of psychoneurosis reported up to Nov. 1, 1918 (all of whom are practically recommended for discharge)—	14,747
Total—	42,967

Making a grand total of actual and potential beneficiaries of the War Risk Insurance Bureau of 42,967. When it is considered that this does not include the beneficiaries of the merchant marine, the United States Coast Guard Service, the Army Transport Service, and the civilian employees of the workman's compensation act, all of whom must also look for care and treatment to the Public Health Service, the need for these facilities provided by this bill must be apparent.

I think that probably it is not fully understood just what are the demands on the Public Health Service. The statement by the House committee in its report shows a need for increased facilities. The merchant marine hospitals, for instance, scattered along up and down the coast, need to be enlarged in some respects, for that service, as the Senator has suggested, has grown extensively. It would seem that unquestionably there is a great need for additional facilities for the Public Health Service.

Now, as to the Army hospitals, I think the War Department is supplied with ample hospital accommodations; but this is entirely outside of the Army. It is a matter that needs immediate attention because we can not fail to take proper care of these cases.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for reading from that report. It is very interesting and indicates the gravity of the situation. There is no doubt that we have got to provide facilities in some way. Whether we will build new hospitals or utilize hospitals in the cantonments or utilize some public buildings is a matter which ought to be determined by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. I hope it will determine the question speedily and report upon these bills, because we undoubtedly need this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I happen to be a member of both committees, and I voted to report this bill because I believe that it is necessary that something be done immediately to take care of the wounded and the maimed soldiers who have become or will become public charges. The Army, through the cantonments and the rehabilitation hospitals, is taking care of the soldiers who are still in the Army; but when they are discharged from the Army, if they are maimed, if they are incapacitated, it is necessary, through the War Risk Insurance, that as civilians they be taken care of by another department. Therefore they become charges of the Public Health Service.

These men are not only tubercular patients, but they are the poor wrecks of humanity who have been sent over here maimed and incapacitated for life. Only on Saturday I heard from one of the hospital attendants, a Red Cross nurse in New York, of the case of a man who was landed in this country without his arms and legs, and they had to carry him to the hospital in a clothes basket. Turning to the woman who was helping carry

that basket, he asked, "Are you from the South?" She replied, "Yes; how did you know?" He said, "By your voice; for I can not see." There is a ward in the Greenhut Hospital in New York that is closed to visitors because the men there are so maimed and wounded that they are kept from the sight of visitors. It is those men for whom we must provide.

Possibly there may be facilities in the cantonments, but the method of arriving at a proper settlement of that question is to ask the Surgeon General what hospital facilities he has that he can turn over to the Treasury Department. If the bill is referred to that committee I shall recommend that plan as a method whereby we can use the hospital facilities which we now have; but if we have no hospital facilities, if there is nothing available, we should appropriate all the money that is necessary to take care of these poor unfortunates, and there are many of them.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Louisiana, may I have the attention of the Senator from New Jersey? It may interest him for me to tell him of what was an interesting revelation to me. In company with a committee I went to the Surgeon General's office to make inquiry respecting hospital accommodations, and was pleased and equally surprised to hear him say that at Fort Myer there is such space of accommodations, to use his words, that they have many beds bidding for occupants, but for some reason or other there has not been enough demand for the use of those beds to occupy them to their capacity. If conditions be as the able Senator from New Jersey indicates they must be, it seems to me remarkable that the Surgeon General's Office here should be informed that there were not enough applicants needing hospital attention to fill the beds, which he informed me and also informed the committee are to-day vacant. Something is evidently irregular in the method of transferring information to the Surgeon General's office in connection with such matters as the Senator from New Jersey has brought to the attention of the Senate this morning.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, there may be a hospital at Fort Myer that at the present time has facilities for these wounded men, but it is a question of transportation, a question of the special attention that can be afforded. I know that at the present time the Greenhut Hospital in New York is almost overcrowded with these maimed, broken-down men.

The whole question resolves itself into a question of cooperation between these two departments—the Treasury Department and the Surgeon General's Office. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois can suggest some method whereby they can be coordinated. The Public Health Service and the Surgeon General's Office are working along parallel lines, yet they are separate departments with separate appropriations and separate organizations. The Surgeon General's department has been intrusted with the supervision of the sanitary conditions in the camps, but at the boundary line of the camp their jurisdiction stops, and the sanitary conditions in the zone outside of the camp come under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department—a duplication which I have always considered was not only expensive but entirely unnecessary.

Mr. LEWIS. I can assure the Senator, if I may be pardoned for just a second, that the Surgeon General assured me, and assured the committee of which I was a member, that every effort is being made by the department for the very cooperation to which the Senator refers, and every attention possible that our Government can give is being given to remedy just such instances as the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. SWANSON and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana will have to take charge of the floor.

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the purpose of this reference is to let the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ascertain from the authorities of the Soldiers' Home, of the Army and Navy hospitals, and of the public buildings that are now being constructed what buildings are immediately available for hospital purposes. This inquiry can be made more quickly and more effectively now than if it is delayed. It seems to me that the only committee for this bill to be referred to is to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which could report it back in a few days. I want to say that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the chairman of that committee, is one of the most active and energetic Members of this body. The purpose of this reference is for that committee to investigate what buildings at present constructed and in course of construction can be availed of for that purpose, to make a report, and to have them turned over to the Public Health Service by legislation, so that the buildings can be utilized for this purpose. That is the only purpose of the ref-

erence. Buildings at present constructed that can be utilized for that purpose will give more speedy relief than the construction of new buildings.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just one sentence?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I note that my colleague says that some legislation may be needed. In that connection I desire to say that the Appropriations Committee has inserted in the pending legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill a provision creating a commission to assign space in public buildings to all of the activities of the Government, so that when this matter goes to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds they can call in this commission, if the provision to which I refer is adopted—and it is so worthy that I can not see how it can fail—and this commission on public buildings and grounds can assign space. If there be any space in any public building that can be utilized for hospital purposes it need not call for legislation, but the commission on public buildings and grounds can assign to these hospital purposes such space as the Government has that is suitable for the purpose.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that I am not opposing the reference of this bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, because I believe it would be a good thing; but, if it is practical, I think that not only the Public Health Committee but also the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee should meet jointly and take up the question. Otherwise there will be apt to be conflicts.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, if the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds want the assistance of the Public Health Committee, we shall be very glad to meet with them. We have gone more or less into the merits of the general proposition, which I do not think we ought to discuss here. Everybody seems to agree that the reference should be made to the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, and I hope that order will be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what was done a while ago.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5510) to provide for the construction of a public building at Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5511) for the relief of the estate of the late Capt. Belvedere Brooks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 5512) to amend the Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 5513) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Framingham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 5514) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waltham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 5515) providing for an additional judge for the district of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 5516) to amend an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 5517) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 5518) to provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the health of the rural population of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 5519) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Darlington; and

A bill (S. 5520) granting a pension to Mary A. Lake; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. SHIELDS):

A bill (S. 5521) granting a pension to Jane Roberts; and

A bill (S. 5522) granting an increase of pension to C. F. Boyer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to combat the influenza in Alaska and to afford relief to the indigent natives, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for beginning the construction of the Toppenish and Simcoe Creeks irrigation project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ABROGATION OF TREATIES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, nearly two months ago—in fact, on December 5—the Senate adopted a resolution calling on the Secretary of State for information as to what countries had notified this country of the abrogation of treaties that they may have with the United States, and also countries with which the United States has treaties that would interfere with our passing certain legislation with reference to discriminating duties. It does not seem to me that it ought to take two months to gather the information called for by that resolution; but it has been two months since the Senate adopted the resolution and no response has been received. I submit a further resolution on the subject and ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 436) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the information called for by the Senate resolution of December 5, 1918, or inform the Senate why it can not be furnished.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator whether that resolution should not be directed to the President instead of to the Secretary of State?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suppose the Secretary of State is the custodian of all these treaties.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Of course the Senator knows, however, that the Department of State is organized under a law that is entirely different from that under which any other department is organized. The President is the head of it, and I think it is for him to pass upon these matters.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course the Secretary can report and state why he can not furnish this information.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. CALDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 435), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Whereas a United States merchant marine is of prime importance to this country, not only because of the commercial value in itself of the shipping industry, with shipbuilding and other dependent industries and pursuits, but also because of its influence on our foreign trade and the power of foreign shipping to discriminate against the same, if we are dependent on such shipping, and because of the immediate necessity for a merchant marine in time of national emergency, which it may not be possible to supply in time to avert grave disaster; and

Whereas the Government, as a war measure, has greatly enlarged the shipbuilding facilities and embarked on a shipbuilding program at enormous expense, and this expense should be discontinued and measures taken to make such salvage as is reasonably practicable, unless it is possible to establish a merchant marine on a sound basis which can ultimately absorb the same; and

Whereas, in the final analysis, our ability to maintain a merchant marine in foreign trade upon a sound basis depends on the difference in cost of operation in favor of foreign ships and whether such difference can be obviated or offset: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and hereby is, directed to investigate the difference in cost of operation of vessels of the United States in foreign trade as compared with those of the other principal maritime nations, as now prevailing and as likely to prevail in normal times, with the causes thereof, and to report the results to the Senate.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to announce that, by authorization of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, on next Monday I shall move to take up for consideration the woman-suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I submit the conference report on the census bill, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I shall call the report up for consideration the first opportunity.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 24, 27, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That a census of the population, agriculture, manufactures, forestry and forest products, and mines and quarries of the United States shall be taken by the Director of the Census in the year 1920 and every 10 years thereafter. The census herein provided for shall include each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. A census of Guam and Samoa shall be taken in the same year by the respective governors of said islands and a census of the Panama Canal Zone by the Governor of the Canal Zone, in accordance with plans prescribed or approved by the Director of the Census."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "\$5,000; the chief clerk and three chief statisticians for the divisions of population, manufactures, and agriculture, respectively, \$4,000 each; three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out insert the following: "for the divisions of vital statistics and statistics of cities, and the chief statistician provided for in section 3 of this act, \$3,600 each"; also, on page 4, line 9, of the engrossed bill, strike out the word "and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "\$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "subject to the approval of the United States Civil Service Commission, these"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "applicants claim to have"; also, on page 6, line 16, of the engrossed bill strike out the word "or" where it occurs the first time and insert the word "of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following:

"And provided further, That in the selection of the additional clerks and employees provided for by section 6 the Director of the Census is authorized to use, so far as practicable, the reemployment registers established by Executive order of November 29, 1918, so far as the same applies to permanent appointments by competition."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"Sec. 8. That the Fourteenth Census shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries. The schedules relating to population shall include for each inhabitant the name, place of abode, relationship to head of family, color, sex, age, conjugal condition, place of birth, place of birth of parents, nationality or mother tongue of all persons born in

foreign countries, nationality or mother tongue of parents of foreign birth, number of years in the United States, citizenship, occupation, whether or not employer or employee, whether or not engaged in agriculture, school attendance, literacy, tenure of home and the encumbrance thereon, and the name and address of each blind or deaf and dumb person.

"The schedules relating to agriculture shall include name, color, sex, and country of birth of occupant of each farm, tenure, acreage of farm, acreage of woodland, value of farm and improvements, and the encumbrance thereon, value of farm implements, number of live stock on farms, ranges, and elsewhere, and the acreage of crops and the quantities of crops and other farm products for the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration. Inquiries shall be made as to the quantity of land reclaimed by irrigation and drainage and the crops produced, also as to the location and character of irrigation and drainage enterprises and the capital invested in such enterprises.

"The schedules of inquiries relating to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries shall include the name and location of each establishment; character of organization, whether individual, corporate, or other form; character of business or kind of goods manufactured; amount of capital actually invested; number of proprietors, firm members, copartners and officers, and the amount of their salaries; number of employees and the amount of their wages; quantity and cost of materials used in manufactures; principal miscellaneous expenses; quantity and value of products; time in operation during the year; character and quantity of power used; and character and number of machines employed.

"The census of manufactures, of forestry and forest products, and of mines and quarries shall relate to the year ending December 31, next preceding the enumeration of population, and shall be confined to manufacturing establishments and mines and quarries which were in active operation during all or a portion of that year. The census of manufactures shall furthermore be confined to manufacturing establishments conducted under what is known as the factory system, exclusive of the so-called neighborhood, household, and hand industries.

"Whenever he shall deem it expedient, the Director of the Census may charge the collection of these statistics upon special agents or upon detailed employees, to be employed without respect to locality.

"The number, form, and subdivision of inquiries provided for in section 8 shall be determined by the Director of the Census." And the Senate agree to the same.

MORRIS SHEPPARD,
H. F. ASHURST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
W. C. HOUSTON,
J. B. ASWELL,
CHARLES A. NICHOLS,
Managers on the part of the House.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 15018. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 15219. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, is the morning business closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not yet. Is there any further morning business? [A pause.] The morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I know it is subject to a point of order to interfere with the calendar; but the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is on the calendar, and I think it will take a very short time to pass it. There are not many amendments. It is of great importance that it should be disposed of at an early hour; and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the legislative bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he purposes to let it interfere with the Post Office bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; not unless the chairman will consent when it comes up. I think the legislative bill can be finished before 2 o'clock.

Mr. SWANSON. At 2 o'clock the Senator does not purpose to request that the consideration of the legislative bill be continued?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we are within a few minutes of finishing it, I will ask the chairman's permission to complete it.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, I shall not object to that; but the Senator will not interfere seriously with the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I will not interfere seriously.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I had intended to object, as I have heretofore announced, to any interference with Calendar Monday, but on account of the very great importance of this particular bill, I shall make no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the Secretary may read the bill for amendments, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, out of deference to the wishes expressed by certain members of the Appropriations Committee, I have consented to having this matter taken up. I had intended to call up the Michigan election resolution this morning. I will not do that now, but it will be my purpose to call it up to-morrow morning at the close of morning business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator's request contemplate that there shall be no reading of the bill at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the bill will be read, but the formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with, which is usually done with appropriation bills; and then the bill will be read for amendment. I ask, however, that the committee amendments be given prior consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head "Legislative," subhead "Senate," on page 2, line 15, before the word "minute," to strike out "financial clerk"; in line 16, after "\$3,600," strike out "executive clerk, and assistant financial clerk, at \$2,750 each" and insert "financial clerk, \$3,600; assistant financial clerk and printing clerk, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, \$2,750"; in line 20, before the word "assistant," to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "clerk," to strike out "and printing clerk"; and on page 3, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$94,410" and insert "\$95,760," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Secretary: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,250; minute and Journal clerk, principal clerk, and enrolling clerk, at \$3,000 each; reading clerk, \$3,600; financial clerk, \$3,600; assistant financial clerk and printing clerk, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, \$2,750; librarian, file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,500 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, at \$2,400 each; assistant librarian, \$1,800; skilled laborer, \$1,200; clerks—3 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,220 each, 2 at \$2,100 each, 1 at \$1,800, 2 at \$1,600 each, 1 at \$1,440; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,000; assistant in stationery room, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,440; assistant messenger, \$1,200; laborers—3 at \$840 each, 3 at \$720 each, 1 in stationery room, \$720; in all \$95,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, after the word "Committees," to strike out:

Additional accommodations for the Library of Congress—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Agriculture and Forestry—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Appropriations—clerk \$4,000, two assistant clerks at \$2,500 each, two assistant clerks at \$1,440 each, messenger \$1,440, laborer \$720; To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Banking and Currency—clerk \$3,000, assistant clerk \$1,800, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Canadian Relations—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Census—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Civil Service and Retrenchment—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Claims—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Coast and Insular Survey—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Coast Defenses—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Commerce—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; conference minority of the Senate—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, two messengers at \$1,200 each; Conservation of National Resources—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia—clerk \$2,200, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Cuban Relations—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; District of Columbia—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Education and Labor—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Engrossed Bills—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800,

messenger \$1,200; Enrolled Bills—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture—clerk \$2,200, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Department of Commerce—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Interior Department—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Department of Justice—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Expenditures in the Department of Labor—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Navy Department—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Post Office Department—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Department of State—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the Treasury Department—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Expenditures in the War Department—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Finance—clerk \$3,000, assistant clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,600, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440, two experts (one for the majority and one for the minority) at \$2,000 each; Fisheries—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Five Civilized Tribes of Indians—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Foreign Relations—clerk \$3,000, assistant clerk \$2,220, messenger \$1,440; Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Geological Survey—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Immigration—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Indian Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Indian Depredations—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Industrial Expositions—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Interoceanic Canals—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,200; Interstate Commerce—clerk \$2,500, two assistant clerks at \$1,800 each, messenger \$1,440; To Investigate Trespassers Upon Indian Lands—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Judiciary—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$2,220, two assistant clerks at \$1,800 each, messenger \$1,440; Joint Committee on the Library—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Manufactures—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Military Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Mines and Mining—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Mississippi River and Its Tributaries—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; National Affairs—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Pacific Islands and Porto Rico—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Pacific Railroads—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Patents—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Pensions—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, three assistant clerks at \$1,440 each, messenger \$1,440; Philippines—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$2,000, two assistant clerks at \$1,440 each, messenger \$1,440; Printing—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Private Land Claims—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,200; Privileges and Elections—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Public Health and National Quarantine—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Public Lands—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Railroads—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Revolutionary Claims—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Rules—clerk \$2,720 (to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual under the direction of the Committee on Rules), assistant clerk \$1,500, messenger \$1,440; Standards, Weights and Measures—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Territories—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Transportation and Sale of Meat Products—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Transportation Routes to the Seaboard—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; University of the United States—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Woman Suffrage—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; in all, \$428,800.

And to insert—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having charge of this bill about some of these provisions as to clerks and assistant clerks.

All of the assistant clerks to the committees enumerated on pages 8 and 9 seem to draw a salary of \$1,800, except in the case of four committees. These four are Indian Affairs, Manufactures, Privileges and Elections, and Public Buildings and Grounds. Those assistant clerks draw salaries of \$1,500 a year.

I observe, for instance, the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico. The assistant clerk there draws a salary of \$1,800 a year. I suppose that committee has not had a meeting for years. In the case of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is a very busy committee, and will be busy during the next session, the assistant clerk draws a salary of \$1,500 a year. In the case of the Indian Affairs Committee, which is always a busy committee, the assistant clerk draws \$1,440 a year; and, as I have said, the assistant clerk of the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico draws \$1,800. Now, where is the fairness of that?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have not considered the matter of the discrepancy in the salary of the different clerks, to which the Senator has referred, and I do not care to go into that; but I should like to correct his remark in regard to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico itself. I am not the chairman of the committee, and I notice that the chairman is not here. I am a member of the committee, however; and I will say to the Senator that it has frequent meetings and considers a number of very important measures.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad to be advised of that, and I will withdraw my statement about it. I had understood that it had not had a meeting for some time. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Committee on Indian Affairs, and the Committee on Manufactures certainly have had as many meetings, if not more, than the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico. The assistant clerk of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals receives \$1,800. I am simply calling attention to this for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that it is not fair that the assistant clerk doing the same amount of work for one committee as the assistant clerk of some other committee shall be paid a less salary. I do not think that can be justified.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I may say to the Senator that this amendment is what is known as the Jones amendment. It was offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] some years ago, and at various times has been considered by the Appropriations Committee.

I will state the purpose of the amendment, as I understand it. I am not the originator of it, but the purpose is, as far as possible, to equalize these salaries, except as to the big committees, like Appropriations, Finance, Naval Affairs, and Military Affairs, where it was necessary to have higher salaries and more men. But in accomplishing that result the proponent of the amendment did not make an effort to change any of the higher committees, but he attempted to put the clerks of all the smaller committees and the clerks of Senators who had no committees on the same basis.

I think if the Senator will examine the record he will find the cases he referred to carry, under the existing law, as it is written to-day, the same discrimination. As to why that discrimination should be there I do not know, because it was put in long years ago in the Senate before I came in contact with the situation.

Mr. KENYON. That is hardly an argument, however, in its favor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the only argument for offering any change was that the committee are trying to work out a reform that would give the opportunity hereafter for the Rules Committee because we did not have jurisdiction. It was to give the Rules Committee an opportunity to dispense with a lot of committees that really do not function and at the same time to provide a sufficient clerical force for each Senator to do business. This amendment is intended in the main to relate to the minor committees and the clerks of Senators who have no committees. It was not the purpose to disturb the main committees in the bill, and with a few exceptions they have not been disturbed. The discrimination the Senator spoke of was not made by the proponents of the measure or by the committee; it was already in the law.

Mr. KENYON. I call the Senator's attention to the Philippines Committee. There the assistant clerk gets \$1,800 and that committee has not had a meeting for two or three years at least unless to pass on certain nominations. Its work has not been equal to that of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and will not be.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. All these salaries ought either to be put at \$1,800 or reduced to \$1,500.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, I would not say that all through the bill they ought to be made that way, because some of the larger committees must have additional clerks.

Mr. KENYON. But as to committees of similar power and rank.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator the reason why the committee did not change it. It was not as he has said that there is any logic or reason for it, except we ran up against an existing condition and we did not change it. If the Senator wishes to make a change I have no desire to oppose it.

Mr. POMERENE. On line 18, page 9, I move to strike out the numeral "\$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800." That relates to the assistant clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

If I may say just a word with regard to this matter, I know something of the work that committee has had to do in the past and something of the work it will have to do in the future. It is my experience, and I have no doubt it is the experience of other Senators, that these clerks in their offices work longer hours and work harder than do the clerks generally in the various departments, and I think it is no more than just that this salary should be increased.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the Secretary to read the amendment before we consider amendments to it.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in this amendatory list you utterly omitted, as far as I can see, the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On the face of it we have, but as a matter of fact we have not, because we have changed no committees or scrapped no committees, but we have provided that outside of the committees named in the bill in the case of every other committee that is now provided for by the rules of the Senate the clerk of the committee shall get \$2,500, the assistant clerk \$1,500, and the messenger \$1,200. So that committee is provided for in general terms, although not named in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Minnesota will look at the top of page 10 he will find that there are 79 clerks, at \$2,500 each; 79 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each; and 79 messengers, at \$1,200 each, provided for. That covers all the committees not enumerated in the committee amendment, and an additional 10 committees. Those 10 committees are added to take care of the committees of Senators whose terms will expire on the 4th day of March and who will have to continue work until the reorganization of committees takes place in the next Congress. I think that 10 will cover that number and take care of it. In case all the committees not enumerated in the Senate committee amendment the clerks get \$2,500, the assistant clerks \$1,500, and the messengers \$1,200.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill why the Census Committee was omitted from the enumeration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The clerk and assistant clerk of the Census Committee get, under the terms of the bill, more than they got under the old law.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand; but why was the omission made by the committee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because we mentioned only certain specific committees in the salary list that did not come within the general rule. The general rule provides that all clerks of committees not mentioned on this page shall get \$2,500, the assistant clerks \$1,500, and the messengers \$1,200. At the present time the Census Committee clerk gets \$2,220, and the assistant clerk \$1,440, and the messenger \$1,200. Under the terms of this bill the clerk will get \$2,500, the assistant clerk \$1,500, and the messenger, \$1,200. So the Census Committee is better taken care of by this amendment than it was under the old law. It is simply not mentioned in specific terms; that is all.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment of the committee, and was interrupted by,

Mr. ASHURST. In reference to the committee amendment on line 23 for the Committee on Indian Affairs, the amendment provides that the clerk shall receive \$2,500, the assistant clerk \$1,440, and the messenger \$1,440. Of course, my official duty as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs will go into the basket on the 4th of March; I will be decapitated; and the clerk who has been employed under my suggestion will not benefit from this raise, but it is a most glaring inequality.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that was an oversight on the part of the committee.

Mr. ASHURST. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason why it was put in so was because the salary of the messenger of that committee was \$1,440, instead of \$1,200, as provided for the other committees, for if it had not been it would have fallen in the 79.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Arizona that there were three mistakes that we made in drawing the amendment, and when the Secretary gets through with reading it I shall offer them, and then this matter will come up.

Mr. ASHURST. I will wait then.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Really, I intended to offer the amendment the Senator suggested, making the salary of the assistant clerk \$1,500, because it was a mistake. Then there was left out the assistant clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs. That was left out by inadvertence, and also a change that the House made in reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs was not called to the committee's attention.

Mr. SMOOT. Those were paid from the contingent fund of the Senate and not directly appropriated for by the House last year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The clerk informs me that they were appropriated for in the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wish to emphasize the importance of the work of the assistant clerk. As I said, I will no longer be chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs after the 4th of March. Some other Senator now in the minority will be chairman. It is not fair to pay the assistant clerk of the Committee on Indian Affairs \$1,440 or \$1,500 a year, because that

committee has only three employees whereas the Committee on Public Lands has four employees. I do not wish to make any invidious distinction, but the Committee on Indian Affairs gets out an appropriation bill each year which carries eleven or twelve million dollars, and it has to do with \$2,000,000,000 worth of property, embracing one hundred and fifty-odd reservations. I feel that a compensation of \$1,800 for an assistant clerk of that committee is by no means too large.

The Committee on Education and Labor, presided over so well by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], has an assistant clerk who gets \$1,800, and I am sure that the work of the Committee on Indian Affairs is five times the volume of that before the Committee on Education and Labor. Yet I do not think that the assistant clerk of the Committee on Education and Labor is overpaid. In fact, he is a very competent and reliable man and earns \$1,800 a year. I appeal to Senators now, though it can not affect the man whom I employed, to make the salary of the assistant clerk of the Committee on Indian Affairs \$1,800 a year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator, speaking for the committee, we will raise it to \$1,500, where it belongs; but we can not do it until the Secretary concludes the reading of the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I am premature then, and I will sit down.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words stricken out, the Committee on Appropriations report to insert, beginning at line 4, page 8:

Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Appropriations—clerk, \$5,000; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,500 each; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,440 each; messenger, \$1,440; laborer, \$720. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,200. Claims—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440. Commerce—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Conference Minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 2 messengers, at \$1,200 each. District of Columbia—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Education and Labor—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Finance—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,600; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; 2 experts (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$2,000 each. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440. Immigration—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440. Inter-oceanic Canals—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,200. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$2,500; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,800 each; messenger, \$1,440. Judiciary—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,800 each; messenger, \$1,440. Manufactures—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,500; messenger, \$1,440. Military Affairs—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,200. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,440. Pacific Islands and Porto Rico—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Pensions—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 3 assistant clerks, at \$1,440 each; messenger, \$1,440. Philippines—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,440 each; messenger, \$1,440. Printing—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,500; messenger, \$1,440. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,500; messenger, \$1,440. Public Lands—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,200. Rules—clerk, \$2,720, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual, under the direction of the Committee on Rules; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440; in all, \$194,940.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator in charge if he does not think it would be better, instead of saying 79 messengers, to say 79 assistant clerks? Scarcely a Senator uses a messenger; frequently it is a lady stenographer; and I really think that the title of assistant clerk is more appropriate than that of messenger.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator the committee did not wish to change the order of things where it did not affect the situation. I recognize the force of what the Senator says, but we have messengers, and we did not want to change it. If the Senator desires to offer the suggestion by way of an amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will do so because really they are not messengers; they are clerks. There is scarcely a Senator who uses one as a messenger, and I know the employees would rather be called clerks, because they are doing clerical work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the Senator to allow me to offer several amendments first.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish first to ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to adjust all totals in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On page 8, line 24, I move that the salary of the assistant clerk to the Committee on Indian Affairs be made \$1,500 instead of \$1,440. I offer this amendment to the amendment to correct a mistake.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee overlooked another point. At present an assistant clerk during the period of the war, at \$1,440, is provided for the Committee on Military Affairs. We were looking at the general legislation and not at the recent enactment and therefore we overlooked it. At the end of line 7, page 9, I move to insert "assistant clerk during the period of the war, \$1,440."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We also, in the same way, overlooked two other amendments. The present law provides for an assistant clerk to the Committee on Naval Affairs, at \$2,220, and an additional messenger, at \$1,440. On page 9, line 9, I move to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,220," and after "\$1,440," on line 9, I move to insert a semicolon and the words "messenger, at \$1,440."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the end of the committee amendments to this amendment. If the Senator from Georgia desires to offer his amendment, he can do so now.

Mr. CURTIS. Do I understand that the Senator from Arizona is going to offer an amendment in line 24, page 8, to make the salary of the assistant clerk of the Committee on Indian Affairs \$1,800?

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator in charge of the bill let me answer the question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. ASHURST. As I stated when the Senator from Kansas was out of the Chamber, the assistant clerk of the Committee on Indian Affairs has been paid at the rate of \$1,440 per annum, with the 10 per cent increase which all employees received for that period. It is my judgment, and I feel entirely unembarrassed in making this statement, because I will soon no longer be chairman, that if that clerk were paid \$2,000 a year he would not be overpaid. In fact, \$1,800 a year for that clerk is a modest salary and is not high.

I make no invidious comparison, but I wish to say that assistant clerks of other committees, which I do not think do the same amount of work, receive \$1,800 a year, which is proper. Moreover, every other committee which handles an appropriation bill has an assistant clerk, who is paid \$1,800. I think the record will bear me out in that statement.

I do not mean to exaggerate the importance of the committee over which I happen temporarily to be chairman, but I repeat, it handles an \$11,000,000 appropriation bill every year; it has to do with \$2,000,000,000 worth of property under its jurisdiction on Indian reservations; it has 153 Indian reservations, scattered in 27 or 28 States, and its volume of work is enormous, as Senators who are members of the committee will testify.

I respectfully submit that the assistant clerk of the committee ought to get \$1,800 a year. I do not know who is going to get it, and I do not care, but whoever does get it, in my judgment, will earn it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that I think, now that we have adopted \$1,500 as the salary in these cases, he will find that the salary of the assistant clerk of that committee is on a basis with the salary fixed at \$1,500 in the bill as to a good many other committees of like importance.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator from Alabama kindly tell me what other committee of "like importance" reports an appropriation bill providing for an expenditure of ten, eleven, or twelve million dollars; which has to deal with trust funds and with trust property which amount to two thousand million dollars; which has to do with questions of policy, and with very large questions of policy? I should like to know of another committee which has that much work and that much important work to do whose second man, whose assistant clerk, is only paid \$1,500 per annum.

Let me repeat, here is the Committee on Public Lands, which is a very important committee, but which does not do any more work, and, in my judgment, does not do as much work, as does the Committee on Indian Affairs, and yet it has four—and it should have four—clerks, and the second clerk receives \$1,800 a year. As to the Committee on Education and Labor, which is so well presided over by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], their assistant clerk—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Arizona will allow me to interrupt him, I desire to say that on a reexamination of the bill—the amendment was prepared by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and we were not attempting to equalize the salaries of any of these main clerks—I think the Senator is correct in stating that there is no committee having an appropriation bill in charge where its second clerk gets less than \$1,800 a year.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the second clerk of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds gets \$1,500 a year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But among the bills reported by that committee there is no appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Quite often that committee does report appropriations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it is merely an authorization for appropriations.

Mr. ASHURST. I will venture the assertion that that committee does not meet once in three months; I will venture the assertion that it does not meet once in six months; and yet its second clerk gets \$1,800 a year, and he should get it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I am not authorized by the committee to accept this amendment, and therefore I can not do it; but I am willing for the Senate to vote on it; and I am willing to admit that, outside of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which does not report general appropriation bills, the second clerks on committees reporting general appropriation bills do receive salaries not less than \$1,800. So with that statement I will let the Senate decide the question.

Mr. ASHURST. Then, Mr. President, if in order at this time I will move an amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator can do that he will have to move that the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ASHURST. I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, if in order, I move, on line 24, page 8, after the words "assistant clerk," to strike out the numerals "\$1,440" and to insert "\$1,800."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 24, after the words "assistant clerk," it is proposed to strike out "\$1,440" and to insert "\$1,800."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It has been stated that I prepared this amendment. It is true that it is known as my amendment, and yet in preparing the amendment I did not endeavor to correct all of the inequalities with reference to the clerks of committees. I tried that a few years ago and found that I could not get very far. So in the preparation of this amendment I tried to correct the inequalities in so far as I thought there was a chance to do it. I did not endeavor to correct any inequalities in the matter of the compensation of the clerks where, according to law, we have been carrying appropriations for them more than would be given by the amendment which I finally proposed.

There was a mistake, in my judgment, with reference to the assistant clerk of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I intended to make that salary \$1,500, as I had done as to the others, but it has been carried all along in the laws heretofore at \$1,440.

I think the Senator from Arizona is right with reference to the duties and responsibilities of the employees of the Indian Affairs Committee. While I am not a member of that committee, I have had a good deal to do with it and have been brought in contact with the work of that committee. I know that it is one of the hardest worked committees of the Senate, and I know its employees are worked all the time. So I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona is very fair and will correct one of the inequalities which I did not try to correct, except to place the assistant clerk on the same basis as the other assistant clerks by my amendment.

There may be other inequalities existing with reference to the clerks named in this amendment, but they are inequalities not created by my action at all, but created by the action of the Congress in heretofore providing larger compensation for the assistant clerk of one committee than for the assistant clerk of another of probably equal responsibility and equal duties.

I felt that I really ought to say this in justice to myself. As I have stated, I have not tried by my amendment now to correct all of these inequalities, as I tried that once and did not get anywhere. I found out that by trying to correct inequalities of a class I would get somewhere. I am also glad to see that the probabilities are that I will get further than I really expected to get, and that we shall on the floor of the Senate correct some more of these very glaring inequalities. I really think the amendment of the Senator from Arizona ought to be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I now renew my former motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 18, after the words "assistant clerk," it is proposed to strike out "\$1,500" and to insert "\$1,800."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. It seems to me that other inequalities in this bill ought to be corrected. Therefore, on page 9, line 7, after the words "assistant clerk," I move to strike out "\$1,500" and to insert "\$1,800."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

Clerical and other assistance to Senators: For clerical and other assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of the committees specifically provided for herein: Seventy-nine clerks at \$2,500 each; 79 assistant clerks at \$1,500 each; 79 messengers at \$1,200 each; in all, \$410,800: *Provided*, That such clerks, assistant clerks, and messengers shall be ex officio clerks, assistant clerks, and messengers of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire, in line 5, to move that the word "messengers" be stricken out. I take it for granted that I will not be the chairman of a committee in a short time, and I know I will not need a messenger, but I will need a stenographer. I need a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a stenographer. If I offer the place to some capable young man or lady, I know the designation "stenographer" would be more agreeable than that of "messenger." It tells at least what the employee does. We have messengers in the Senate; we have our messengers at the post office; we can call messengers from the Sergeant at Arms office to do our messenger work. The force provided for in this part of the bill is really to do our office work, and there should be provided a stenographer, not a messenger. I therefore move, in line 5, to strike out the word "messengers" and insert the word "stenographers."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator not to insist upon the word "stenographers," but that he change it to "assistant clerks."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would rather have it "assistant clerks."

Mr. SMOOT. That is the proper designation, because I know, as it developed in a discussion that we had when this matter was previously before the Senate, that there are only a few committees where the messenger is not a stenographer. We can simply strike out the word "messengers" and insert "assistant clerks."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I prefer the designation "assistant clerk," because that assistant clerk can be a stenographer and can do other work if necessary, such as that of a filing clerk. In my office I have employed, outside of the help allowed me, an assistant clerk who does filing and work of a similar character. I think the designation "assistant clerk" is a great deal better. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] suggested that I make it "stenographers" instead of "messengers," but "assistant clerks" covers it, and I really think it a better designation. I therefore move that the word "messengers" be stricken out and the words "assistant clerks" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the word "messengers" and insert in lieu thereof the words "assistant clerks."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hope that that change will be made. We have gone on now for years with this old designation of "messenger." I do not know why it was preferred, but perhaps it was thought to be less unpopular than the other designation. However, we might as well describe these employees correctly. I think they ought to be described correctly all through these provisions of the bill. We have made provision for messengers on many committees, where they ought to be assistant clerks. That is what they are; none of them are messengers, and they ought to be described properly throughout. I do not know how they are designated in other provisions, but I think they are described wrongfully everywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In line 7, on page 10, the word "messengers" should be stricken out and the words "assistant clerks" inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, at the beginning of line 7, it is proposed to strike out the word "messengers" and insert the words "assistant clerks."

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to direct the Senator's attention to the fact that unless we say "second assistant clerks" we are going to have the appropriation of very doubtful and confused meaning.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it is necessary to insert the word "second." We very frequently in appropriation bills provide for more than one assistant clerk.

Mr. KIRBY. Unless the amendment is changed, it would read "assistant clerks, and assistant clerks."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are both assistant clerks, but at different salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; one would have one salary and another a different salary.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will read the bill, he will find three or four places where the words are used in the same way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, at the beginning of line 7, it is proposed to strike out the word "messengers," so as to read:

Provided, That such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, before the amendment is agreed to I wish to say a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington object to the amendment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; but I want to say a word before it is adopted.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Washington is merely struggling to obtain recognition; that is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wish to discuss the amendment for a moment. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment to the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered in order that the Senator from Washington may have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as I have said, I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment. I think it ought to be adopted. I would have put some provision of that kind in my suggested amendment, but I was afraid I might run counter to one of the hoary customs of the Senate or of Congress and have more difficulty than would otherwise be experienced. I think in the first amendment on this subject that I proposed a few years ago I eliminated messengers. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said, the messengers provided for the committees—most of them, at any rate—as a matter of fact are not messengers at all; they are not used as messengers, but they are used as clerks and stenographers; and the same thing is true with reference to the clerical force of Senators who are not chairmen of committees. So that I welcome the change made. The designation "assistant clerk" is entirely satisfactory to me. It corrects another one of the inequalities that I was afraid we might not be able to have corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. STERLING addressed the Chair.

Mr. POMERENE. I was trying to offer another amendment; but if the Senator from South Dakota desires to discuss the pending matter, I will yield to him.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to know how the provision will read, beginning in line 9. It will read, as I understand, "such clerks, assistant clerks, and assistant clerks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment of the committee as proposed to be amended.

The SECRETARY. As proposed to be amended, the paragraph will read:

Clerical and other assistance to Senators: For clerical and other assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of the committees specifically provided for herein: 79 clerks at \$2,500 each, 79 assistant clerks at \$1,500 each, 79 assistant clerks at \$1,200 each; in all, \$410,800: *Provided*, That such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Mr. STERLING. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio allow me?

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator is going to address himself to the pending amendment I yield to him. I was going to offer another amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to move to strike out the figures "\$1,200" in line 5, and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,440."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. I was going to offer the same kind of an amendment, except I was going to make the amount \$1,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. LODGE. At what point does the amendment come in?

Mr. POMERENE. I offer my amendment to come in on page 10, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,200" and to insert "\$1,500," so that it will read:

Seventy-nine assistant clerks at \$1,500 each; 79 assistant clerks at \$1,500 each.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I think I know something of the work which these employees have to perform. I know that in the case of a Senator from a State such as my own it is utterly impossible to do the necessary work with the limited help that is given here, and any man or woman who is capable of being a stenographer in a Senator's office earns \$1,500. I do not think there should be any distinction at all as between the salaries of assistant clerks and stenographers, and I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the amendment is going to be adopted, of course the other portion of the amendment should be changed. Instead of "79" it ought to read "158 assistant clerks at \$1,500 each" and the remainder of the clause stricken from the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I have no objection to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LODGE. That will put it in proper form.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that I doubt the wisdom of giving both classes of assistant clerks exactly the same salary. There has always been a difference. So far as I am concerned, I will say to the Senator that the assistant clerk I have always used has been a man whom I employ for work in the departments. My messenger has always been a stenographer, and generally a lady stenographer, who never has to go outside of the room. When conditions require I use her for a filing clerk as well. There is quite a difference between the two employees, but under this provision they would receive the same salary, and there would be a great deal of dissatisfaction. I believe if we are going to make this change and make the salary of the second assistant clerk \$1,500 then the first assistant clerk ought to receive more than \$1,500, because there is an additional responsibility upon him, and he would be called upon to do more work than the other would have to do.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I recognize that there is some force in what the Senator says, but each Senator has it in his power to so classify the work of his office as to equalize the duties being performed according to the salary received. Now, I know a little about the Senator's office and the amount of work he does, and I dare say that with the \$1,500 salary every clerk he has in his office will earn every dollar he or she gets. That is the way I feel about it in my office. Whether I am chairman of a committee or not is neither here nor there. I want to see these clerks reasonably well paid, and I think Senators ought to blush with shame because of the fact that they have been underpaid during the last several years.

Mr. SMOOT. All that I wanted to impress upon the Senator was that if we are going to have a \$1,500 clerk instead of a \$1,200 messenger, then by all means let us change the salary of

\$1,500 for the first one to \$1,600 and have at least that much difference.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator means, make the salary of the first one \$1,600?

Mr. SMOOT. The first \$1,600 and the second \$1,500.

Mr. POMERENE. I will accept that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what ought to be done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, as modified, to the amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. On lines 4 and 5 of page 10 it is proposed to change the numerals so that it will read: "79 assistant clerks at \$1,600 each," striking out "\$1,500" and inserting "\$1,600"; "79 assistant clerks at \$1,500 each," striking out "\$1,200" and inserting "\$1,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That carried both amendments—\$1,600 and \$1,500—did it not?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before we leave this matter I think we ought to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the action on the former amendment, for that will have to be changed from beginning to end, not only as to the question of messengers but in many respects as to the clerks and the assistant clerks.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact, too, that the gross amount there should be changed.

Mr. SMOOT. That has already been done by a motion of the chairman. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the vote whereby the Senate agreed to the amendment to which I have just referred may be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, before we open that matter I should like to have the Senator present his amendment. I think we can agree by unanimous consent to what he wants without opening the whole thing again. I ask the Senator to let us go ahead with the bill, with the understanding that we will come back and take up this matter before we close. Then if he will make his suggestion I understand what he is after.

Mr. SMOOT. With that understanding, Mr. President, I will not press the matter at this time.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I move to increase the salary of the assistant clerk of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from \$1,500 to \$1,800, the same as the other assistant clerks of committees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That provision has been disposed of for the present, but as it requires some other amendments that are not ready I ask that the section may go over until we finish the bill, and we will take it up then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. FERNALD. I should like to have the action on the amendment reconsidered, because I shall be out of the city at the time, and I am afraid it will get by.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On account of the amendment to the salaries of assistant clerks the whole section will have to be changed, and when we reach it, which will be in a few hours anyway, we will make the changes to conform all along the line.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so that all of the Senators may understand the situation, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] in particular, I will state that the amendment on pages 8 and 9 has been agreed to, but it is understood that later in the consideration of the bill we will revert to it and make the changes that are absolutely necessary on account of the amendments that have already been adopted on page 10.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is, so as to make the changes necessary to make it conform to what we have already done; not opening it up generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 12, after line 4, to strike out:

For assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, as follows: Thirty clerks, at \$2,000 each; 30 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each; 30 messengers, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$132,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 8, after the word "labor," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$100,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what are the miscellaneous items for which the \$100,000 is sought?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that that increase is largely due to the number of funerals we have had in the Senate in the past year, and employees taken care of in the same way. There are other things involved, however.

Mr. KING. While I am on my feet, I should like to ask the Senator what provision has been made in lieu of the matter found in lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, page 12, which the committee has stricken out?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is taken care of in the other amendments back on pages 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. KING. I was out of the Chamber for the moment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On page 10 that proposition is taken care of; so that we struck out the usual provision with reference to assistant clerks to Senators, and put it back here with the general committee clerks. That is taken care of on page 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 12, on page 21.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside, and thus an opportunity will be given to continue the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill. I am compelled to attend a conference on the water-power bill at 2 o'clock, and therefore I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there any objection?

Mr. LODGE. That is for the purpose of continuing the legislative appropriation bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the legislative appropriation bill is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is before the Senate.

PEACE POLICIES.

Mr. HALE. I recall, Mr. President, that at the beginning of the war a great wave of patriotism swept over this country. Much as we dreaded war, it was felt by many of us that this patriotic spirit would do great things for our country; that made up, as we are, of a citizenship drawn from most of the other countries of the world, this spirit of patriotism brought on by the war would weld these peoples together and make good Americans of them all. To my mind this was one of the price-less advantages which I expected to see come to this country from our going into the war. Is this all to be lost?

Horace tells us.

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.

(It is sweet and glorious to die for one's country.)

What an odd sound that has in these days. Fifty-odd thousand American men have lost their lives in the great war—have lost their lives, we are now told, for humanity, for civilization, for the cause of the smaller nations, for world democracy—and not one, we are told, for his country. Patriotism as a virtue is relegated to the scrap heap. This, if I am not mistaken, is the message the President carries to an admiring world. The American soldier fought for no selfish purpose, for no national cause, but for abstract ideals of justice and of right for the world. For these ideals he fought, and for these ideals he died. The war is won, and the ideals for which we fought are to be realized. We alone of the nations fought for something greater and finer than for our country, and it is ours to dictate the peace terms to the world and the basis on which the world shall be run after the treaty of peace shall have been signed. True, as was shown in the debate recently, our losses in the war were less than one-twentieth of the losses of France or of Great Britain, but our aims were so much higher than the aims of the other nations that to us must it be given to be the arbitrators of the destiny of the world. And fearlessly and confidently and, I believe, in all sincerity the President goes about the mighty task.

And as in the war we fought for no selfish purpose, to avenge no wrongs done to us, to insure no special benefit to ourselves, so in the peace which is to follow the war we must have no selfish aim, must exact no special indemnity, must sacrifice any particular advantages that we as a Nation may have for the benefit of humanity in general. We have put our hands to the plow. There must be no turning back.

And yet, Mr. President, I recall that some of us in this Chamber voted to declare that a state of war existed with the Imperial German Government under the impression that the safety of this country was directly menaced by the German Empire. We believed that a victorious Germany, or even an unwhipped Germany, meant a future conflict for us, or, if not an actual conflict, at least it meant the turning of our country into an armed camp, to protect ourselves against the German menace. For no higher reason than this, I say, some of us voted for war. It seemed to us, if war with Germany was bound to come, that we were choosing a particularly opportune time to enter, when we had most of the civilized world fighting on our side, when Germany was to a considerable extent exhausted after more than two and a half years of bitter fighting with the allies. And the allies really had fought hard and well before we came into the war, even though they were fighting for no higher purpose than to preserve their own existence as nations. Later on, when we had to raise immense sums of money by taxation and by loan, some of us still clung to the same old beliefs about the purposes of the war. When we voted for the draft we felt that we were justified in forcing the young men of the country into the service because of the dire need of our country. We felt that we had the right to call on these men to sacrifice their lives for the United States of America, and for the United States of America alone. I know that I personally should not have felt justified in voting to draft these men into the Army to fight for humanity in general or for world democracy, or for any other purpose than the saving of our own country.

Mr. President, there is another class of men in this country who look at this war as some of us in the Senate have looked at it. I refer to the men in the Army and the Navy of the United States. I have talked with many officers and enlisted men who have served in this country and overseas, wounded men, men who have been crippled in their country's cause. I have yet to find one single man who claims that he was in the war to fight for any other cause than the cause of his country and to defeat the Hun. I have found no crusader spirit amongst any of the men with whom I have talked. On the contrary, I have found a strenuous objection on the part of these men to being considered crusaders. They are not the talkers. They are the men who have done the job, the men who have made possible the defeat of the central powers. All of the glory that comes to us through this war comes through their work, and their work alone. They knew for what they were fighting. They fought and they are entitled to be heard.

The issue comes squarely down to the question whether or not the people of this country went into this war and carried it through for the purposes proclaimed by the President. If the President is right, then let us make a peace that is in conformity with such humanitarian purposes, and in the future let us govern our actions toward the rest of the world in the spirit of sacrifice that these high and extremely unselfish purposes demand; but let us count the cost when we are doing so. We may have to surrender our sovereignty as a Nation; we may have to maintain armies in all parts of the world; we may have to finance and set upon their feet and sustain the less fortunate nations of the world. What does it matter? It is all in the program, and if that is what we fought for, we should be making but a poor showing as a Nation if we balked at any of these things. But is it what we fought for? On the other hand, if we fought primarily for this country and only incidentally for the rest of the world, now that we have practically accomplished our task in crushing the German menace, are we not justified in extricating ourselves in so far as it may be possible and as soon as it may be possible from the present international mix-up with the greatest possible advantage to ourselves as a Nation that is compatible with dignity and justice and a proper regard for the rights of others?

Mr. President, I do not wish to decry the work of the President of the United States. I have already given him credit for sincerity in his motives, but I believe that his ideals are not the ideals of the vast majority of the people of the United States. These ideals, it is fair to state, were expressed to the country during the progress of the war, and because they were not publicly turned down by the American people or by their Representatives in Congress the President considers that the American people are pledged to their fulfillment. Mr. President, the American people never understood the meaning or con-

sequence of the ideals and policies of President Wilson. They were given out at a time when as Commander in Chief of the Armies of the country it was held universally to be an unpardonable sin to criticize the President of the United States. The wonderful catchwords and phrases of the President caught the ear of the people, but did not catch their understanding. That they were binding themselves to an irrevocable policy as a Nation, I venture to say, never occurred to any but the President's closest advisers. That the American people are bound by any of these statements of ideals or policy is to me inconceivable. They certainly never were bound by the vastly different declarations of the President during the weary months before we went into the war. But enough has been said about that already and far better said that I can say it. I speak of the period of the war and the period now following the war. The men now in the saddle and doing the talking in this country are not the fighting men. Fighting men are not given to much talk. It is very significant that in France, where the Army is near the seat of government, there is little theoretical talk and little time wasted over the development of impracticable ideals.

Men who have seen the realities of war get to be very practical. Nor are the men from whom we are hearing so much in this country the men who carried the country along during the war. The theorists, the idealists—the people especially who never would have had us go into the war—are now in the front line of trenches and loudly and vociferously are they contending for the millennium. But underneath all this the great still mass of the American people are awaiting their time. They are a patriotic people. They never would have consented to go to war had they not believed their country to be in danger. Once in the war, nothing could stop them from keeping on until the war was won, and by their steadfast insistence on winning the war they forced the officials of this Government, you and me and all other officials, to speed up and speed up until the work was done. This great onrushing tide was not led by us. We were carried along ahead of it. And now that the job is done and the war is won, I believe that the American people want peace, and they want it without further delay. They want their boys back in this country and they want to get back to the work that they were doing before the war. They want and they expect their representatives at the peace conference to close matters up just as quickly as can be done, and they insist that these representatives shall look after the material interests of the United States just as the material interests of the rest of the allies are being looked after by their representatives. They feel that we have fought a good fight, and they are intensely proud of the men who have done the fighting; that we should take no unfair advantage of any other nation, and that neither should we sacrifice any advantage that fairly belongs to us. Least of all do they want to give up any more than is absolutely necessary of the great natural advantages that our geographical position gives us in relation to the rest of the world. That the result of the war is a benefit to civilization they are glad and to take reasonable steps to make future wars improbable they are willing, but to have the responsibility and burden of carrying out these steps placed on their shoulders they will never stand, nor will they stand for any plan that in any way affects their sovereignty as a nation or commits them to any policy of internationalism. When all is said and done, Mr. President, the American people are for America first, and they have no desire nor intention to wander very far from the faith and teachings of their fathers.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the deductions the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has made with reference to the utterances preliminary to the peace conference now taking place at Versailles have led him into a vein of pessimism regarding the future of this country and the attitude which the United States would be compelled to take toward great international problems which I think is unwarranted in view of the parallels which may be found in the record of the last great peace conference which decided the fate of the world, the boundaries of contesting nationalities, and the rights of striving peoples.

I think, Mr. President, that the parallel between the preliminaries which preceded the congress at Vienna and those which preceded the congress now sitting at Versailles run both close and far. Following the downfall of Napoleon, the coalition which had brought about that happy event were loud in their declaration that they had not made war upon the French people, that they had warred only upon Napoleon and his system, just as we have been hearing that we have had no controversy and no quarrel with the German people, but that our fight was with the Hohenzollern and with autocracy.

Indeed, Mr. President, one who follows diplomatic history and who has noted the lofty declarations which were uttered during the latter period of the controversy with Napoleon will

be struck by the similarity of language which is to be found between the declarations, let us say, of Alexander I of Russia, who was the proponent then of a league of nations, and the declarations of some of the proponents of a league of nations now.

For example, we find Alexander described by his closest companion, Czartoryski, who, as near as I can make out, was the Col. House of that era, as one of the group who had brought over into the nineteenth century the illusions of the eighteenth, who felt that in their own particular formula they possessed the remedy for all the ills from which mankind may suffer, that their particular panacea was a touchstone to cure all the ills of humanity, and that—to use the striking phrase of Czartoryski—a few sacramental phrases were all that were necessary to solve any problem growing out of the relations of peoples. We find that very closely paralleled here.

We find the description of Alexander paralleled further when Czartoryski said, as I recall, that the Czar was willing that everyone should be free, provided that everyone should do as he wished.

So they went to the council at Vienna in the same spirit of declaration which the Senator from Maine has described as obtaining to-day, and the sacramental phrases were even more resonant than any that have been uttered of late.

Yet, Mr. President, we find when that conference had ended there was no confederation of Europe by which the sovereignty of any peoples had been surrendered. There were no guaranties of the doctrine of nationality which worked evil to any of the nations who sat about the conference table. There was no outcome of the deliberations which tended in any way toward a condition such as the Senator from Maine seems to fear.

I do not think, Mr. President, that we need to bother ourselves greatly about the outcome of the deliberations at Versailles. It is true that Alexander had to go back to Paris in the effort to complete his work. So we learn that some of the great plenipotentiaries of to-day purpose to go back to Paris to complete their work.

It is also true, Mr. President, that Alexander had to attend five other conferences before the futility of the plan was at length made clear. I hope that no such number of conferences will attend in the train of the conference now sitting at Versailles, but I have no doubt that the outcome of the deliberations now taking place in the Hall of Mirrors will be no different in their great and ultimate result from those which took place a century ago, and when they are over, through the interposition of some agency, probably that of widespread human nature, which extends to the ruling powers as well as to the humblest of mankind, we will find, through the application of that motive power, that Versailles has saddled upon us no unusual problem and given to us no undue burden.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire entirely leaves the territory, he very happily alluded to one who might represent Alexander I at the Congress of Vienna. Will the Senator inform this body who would represent Prince Clemens Metternich and who would represent Talleyrand? Are there such characters present at this conference?

Mr. MOSES. I would be glad indeed to translate the dramatic personae of the congress at Vienna into the terms of the conference at Versailles, but I do not think any Senator here present—certainly I do not think that the acute mind of the Senator from Illinois—requires any enlightenment from me in that regard. I think he is as quick to perceive a parallel as any Senator on the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I may say by the time the congress of Vienna really began—it occupied much time in palaver and formalities—but by the time they really began Napoleon grew restless at Elba and left the place that was assigned to him and landed on the coast of France and started a hundred-day whirlwind that dispersed the congress of Vienna. The Kaiser is in Holland in friendly surroundings; Hindenburg is at the head of the German Army. Is there any similarity between that period of the congress at Vienna and the present time? I think there is.

Mr. President, I wish to give notice—like the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I do not think it entirely necessary—that to-morrow, if there should be a morning hour, immediately after the conclusion of that morning hour, or at such time to-morrow as I may be able to procure the floor, I will submit some remarks on superman government and self-government.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Gov-

ernment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Spencer
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Overman	Swanson
Culberson	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Cummins	King	Pittman	Townsend
Dillingham	Kirby	Poinexter	Trammell
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell	Vardaman
France	Lewis	Shafer	Walsh
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Weeks
Harding	McNary	Sherman	Wolcott
Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Smith, S. C.	
Hollis	Martin, Va.	Smoot	

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is detained on official business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, before the reading of the bill is resumed I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to propose an amendment. I make this request because it will be necessary for me to leave the Chamber very shortly for the remainder of the afternoon, and I am afraid the bill may not go over until to-morrow. If the Senator in charge of the bill has no objection, I will offer the amendment now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the amendment proposed by him will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600"; and on the same page, line 16, to strike out "\$3,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, that amendment applies to two well-known employees of the Senate, both of whom are selective—Mr. Kellar and Mr. Loeffler. Mr. Kellar has been an employee of the Senate for 39 years and Mr. Loeffler for 29 years. It is not necessary for me to say to Senators how extremely useful they are in this body. As far back as 30 years ago the salary of the Assistant Doorkeeper was practically \$3,000, and by special enactment the holder of the office of Assistant Doorkeeper had an additional appropriation of \$500; so that, practically speaking, the salary will only be substantially what was the salary of the position 30 years ago. The same pay should, of course, be given to the acting assistant doorkeeper. I hope the amendment may be given favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts move the adoption of the amendment now?

Mr. WEEKS. I move the adoption of the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 26, line 11, after the word "thereof," to strike out "\$30,000" and to insert "\$35,000," so as to read:

Legislative reference: To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ competent persons to gather, classify, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for or bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress and committees and Members thereof, \$35,000.

Mr. LENROOT. I move to amend the amendment of the committee, on page 26, line 12, by striking out the numerals "\$35,000" and inserting "\$45,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that I am in accord with the idea; that this is a very useful function of the Government and a very useful practice; but they themselves asked for but \$40,000.

Mr. LENROOT. I was about to explain the particular purpose for which I move the amendment. It is true that they asked for only \$40,000 for general purposes. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and I, in a conference had with them some

time ago, inquired as to the feasibility of furnishing to each Senator and Member of the House a daily digest of bills reported by the various committees to the respective Houses. They stated that they could do that, and would be glad to do it, under the authority now existing, for an additional sum of \$10,000 per year. It is true it was not estimated for or recommended, although they will be very glad to do this work if Congress desires it to be done.

The situation now is in both Houses, and it always has been so, that a very few industrious Members in either House make their own digest of bills and are prepared, as to the minor bills especially, as they come up, to intelligently discuss them. There are very few who do so in the Senate. There is especially the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who does that kind of work, performing a most valuable service for the country, and there are a few Members in the other House, as the Senator from Alabama well knows, who do likewise. But each Member of either House ought to be able to get information in the way of a digest of bills that are reported, that are upon the calendar, and that will come up for consideration. It ought not to be necessary for 96 Members of the Senate and 433 Members of the other House independently to do this work when it could be done for all of them. If this appropriation is increased by \$10,000, we are assured by the Reference Bureau that they will undertake this work and furnish each Senator and each Member of the other House a digest of the bills reported by the various committees of the Senate and of the House. It would be extremely valuable, and it would save to the country, in my judgment, many times its cost. Each Member could have that information, for, as the situation now is, busy as Senators are, they can not undertake to go through all of these bills and make the digest that is necessary to be made if they are to have the memoranda ready for reference when the bills come up for consideration.

It is a small appropriation, but it will bring in value many times what it will cost, and will enable every Member of both the House and the Senate to make a very much more intelligent consideration of bills that come before the two Houses. I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Wisconsin forgets the fact that the work, if pursued, however, would involve a very large expenditure for printing each day the reports which are to be submitted.

Mr. LENROOT. No; it would involve a very small expenditure; in fact, they discussed as to whether or not they might not make mimeographic copies. At most it would only require 400 or 500 copies a day; and the number of bills reported each day would be comparatively small. It would be merely a digest. I have some sample digests here, covering one sheet of a very long bill. It will enable a Member at a glance to understand what was intended by the bill and how it proposed to change existing law, while now, under the present system, one has to wade through long reports; and, even then, it is sometimes very difficult to understand exactly what is proposed to be accomplished by the bill. Here we should have experts to do the work. The cost for printing would be a very small matter. I have an estimate of the detailed cost here of doing the work, and it can be done for \$10,000 per year.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. Of course, if the bills upon which they submit reports were to be taken up and considered on the day on which the reports were submitted, then I can see that the suggestion of the Senator would be perhaps quite important and that the work would be of considerable benefit to the Senate; but bills after they are reported may not be reached for consideration for weeks and possibly months. As the Senator knows, the daily reports by these experts when a bill was reached would not be available, but would be lost or misplaced. If Senators were interested at all in bills they would not be satisfied with the description of the bill or the analysis of the bill made by somebody else. If they have enough interest in a bill to be present and listen to the debate and participate in it, of necessity they will themselves be compelled to make an examination and analysis of the bills.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Utah is not quite correct in saying this work would be of no value. I know it had been my own practice in the other House for a great many years, and it is my practice now, to myself prepare a digest of the bills as to which I think I shall want to participate in the discussion of; I have one on my desk now, and I have no doubt that other Senators pursue the same practice. It involves a tremendous amount of work upon the part of a Senator, which ought to be accomplished by one man for all of us, and it could be. It would not be lost. Every Senator would have his file of digests

of bills ready in his desk to turn to on the moment. Very many of these bills do come up upon a moment's notice, where one's recollection is gone unless a digest is prepared. A Senator could in a moment turn to that digest and know what that bill sought to accomplish.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator explain precisely by what amount his amendment proposes to increase the appropriation?

Mr. LENROOT. My amendment proposes to increase the appropriation by \$10,000. If this increase is made, the Legislative Reference Bureau agrees that, under the authority which now exists, they will furnish each Member of the House and Senate a daily digest and analysis of bills that have been reported and placed on the calendar in both Houses. That would enable a Senator to keep that daily digest here in his desk and turn to it in a moment whenever a bill came up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely want to make a suggestion that it would be a very easy matter to have the file preserved here on our desks by the Senate force just exactly as the files of reports and bills are now preserved for us.

Mr. LENROOT. That would be very easy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And it would be right at hand for us whenever the bills came up. I think it is a very important provision which the junior Senator from Wisconsin has suggested.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have had quite an experience personally with this kind of work for the last 12 years, at least. There is not a bill introduced in the Senate or in the House that is not placed upon my desk the following morning, and there is hardly an evening when Congress is in session that I do not scan those bills. Of course 90 per cent of them take no time at all, because one who is familiar with the work of Congress readily recognizes the earmarks on them and they are brushed aside. But what the Senator has said applies to the other 10 per cent of the bills introduced. It takes a very great deal of time to prepare a digest of all those bills; in fact, Mr. President, of late I have waited until a bill was reported and went to the calendar before preparing a digest of it. I have been compelled to do that on account of lack of time. But as soon as a bill reaches the calendar, then I think that every Senator ought to know just exactly what the bill is; and the only way he can know is by making a digest, examining it, and ascertaining its scope, object, and purposes. If this work could be accomplished without being made too voluminous—in other words, if judgment is used by those who will prepare the digest, so that only such matters will be brought to the attention of Senators as are likely to be acted upon—I think it would be an immense advantage to every Senator; but I hope, and I simply say now by way of caution, that if this work is undertaken, those who carry it on will not make it so cumbersome and so voluminous that a great deal of its value will be lost. I am positive, however, that if the work is done properly it will be a wonderful advantage to every Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. I will say that I have had the Legislative Reference Bureau make me a number of sample digests, and they have boiled the matter down to the very limit, so that it is not voluminous. Furthermore, I am very sure that on the suggestion of individual Senators at any time, if the bureau does exceed what is thought to be a proper limit, the digest can very easily be brought within a proper scope.

I wish to say in explanation to the Senator from Alabama who is in charge of the bill, that the Senator from Maine and I expected to bring this matter before the committee, and the Senator from Maine did speak to the Senator from Virginia with reference to it; but we did not know the bill was going to be reported so soon, and so we did not bring it before the committee, although we fully intended doing so before the bill was reported.

It is a small increase, but one that I feel very sure will be one of the best expenditures in the interest of the saving of time of Senators and economy to the Government that we could make.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am not prepared to accept the amendment, because I have not the authority of the committee. I will say personally that I believe the Legislative Reference Bureau is doing an excellent work. I think any work that brings information to Senators and Members of the House is useful if it has been properly digested and prepared. So I do not propose to resist the amendment. We may have some difficulty in getting it adopted in conference; but, of course, I will represent the Senate's viewpoint. I repeat that I have no personal objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the law librarian, together with an estimate of the cost of the proposed digest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter referred to is as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, January 18, 1919.

DEAR SENATOR: Referring to the matter of a daily digest of bills reported from committees, which you and Senator LENROOT suggested that the Legislative Reference Service should undertake:

I have made a careful estimate of the work which would be involved and the additional appropriation which would be required to enable us to employ the additional help necessary to turn out this digest promptly each day throughout the session. I have regarded the last month of the short session of the Sixty-fourth Congress as representing the amount of work which we should have to be prepared to handle. The inclosed table gives statistics of the public bills and resolutions (general and local) reported during that period.

Detailed estimates of the additional legislative reference appropriation required are given on a separate sheet. In explanation I may note—

1. That the supervision of the work will add materially to the responsibilities of our chief indexer, Mr. McClenon, who is in charge of the American Law Section, and this should be recognized by the provision of additional compensation.

2. That the digesting should be done by persons who have had a legal education and who are familiar with the work of indexing and digesting. While a great many of the bills are quite simple, there are others that require very careful study by a lawyer to determine just what the legal effect of their provisions is likely to be.

3. If the law clerks are to work efficiently and get out the material promptly they must be properly supported by stenographic assistance.

4. A messenger will be required to procure the bills from the Printing Office in advance of the regular distribution and advance copies from the committees, and also to deliver to the printer the copy and proofs of the digests prepared. (The ordinary methods of distribution do not bring the bills to us at the present time until two or three days after report.)

We have prepared sample digests (also inclosed) for the few bills that were reported on January 15 and 16, 1919, to try out the work and elicit from you any suggestions for improvement, either as to form or substance. I may note that we have not duplicated information which is presented in good form in the report on the bill.

Very truly, yours,

J. DAVID THOMPSON,
Law Librarian.

Hon. FREDERICK HALE,
125 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Statistics of bills reported Feb. 1 to Mar. 4, 1917 (64th Cong., 2d sess.).

Date.	General bills.		Local bills.		Total.	
	Number reported.	Pages.	Number reported.	Pages.	Number reported.	Pages.
Feb. 1.....	6	117	1	2	7	119
2.....	3	131			3	131
3.....	1	1	2	4	3	5
5.....	11	30	5	16	16	46
6.....	7	56	1	2	8	58
7.....	1	2			1	2
8.....	18	64	3	5	21	69
9.....	1	38	1	2	2	40
10.....	5	125	1	2	6	127
12.....	4	37	8	17	12	54
13.....	2	31	4	7	6	38
14.....	2	5	2	4	4	9
15.....	2	6			2	6
16.....	5	42	2	4	7	46
17.....	2	11	1	2	3	13
19.....	3	201	2	4	5	205
20.....	3	12	6	17	9	29
21.....	4	85	3	7	7	92
22.....	7	34	2	13	9	47
23.....	3	36	3	6	6	42
24.....	1	24			1	24
26.....	2	3	2	5	4	8
27.....	6	47	5	10	11	57
28.....	8	173	1	1	9	174
Mar. 1.....	3	268	3	5	6	273
2.....	2	5	4	6	6	11
3.....	1	29	1	1	2	30
4.....			1	2	1	2
28 days.....	113	1,653	64	144	177	1,797

Estimate of additional appropriation needed for preparing a daily digest of bills reported from committees.

Chief indexer, increase of compensation (from \$2,400 to \$3,000) ..	\$600
One law clerk, at \$2,000 ..	2,000
Two law clerks, at \$1,600 ..	3,200
Two stenographers, at \$1,200 ..	2,400
One typist, at \$960 ..	960
One messenger, at \$840 ..	840

Total

10,000

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 29, after line 10, to insert:

For temporary services of additional employees when found necessary, at the discretion of the superintendent, in the operations of the Library Building and Grounds, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the top of page 30.

Mr. KIRBY. I move to amend line 2, on page 30, by striking out the figures "\$2,250" and inserting "\$3,000." I will say, Mr. President, that the Superintendent of the Botanic Garden—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an agreement to conclude committee amendments first, and the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will not be in order until after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. KIRBY. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Bureau of Efficiency," in the item of appropriation to enable the Bureau of Efficiency, authorized by the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved February 28, 1917, to establish and maintain a system of efficiency ratings, etc., on page 32, line 10, before the word "persons," to strike out "nine" and insert "eighteen," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not more than 18 persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$3,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 34, line 15, after the word "each," to insert "ten at \$3,500 each," so as to read:

officers to aid in important drafting work—5 at \$4,500 each, 10 at \$3,500 each, etc.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having this bill in charge what are the duties of the employees referred to in lines 14, 15, and 16, page 34—

Officers to aid in important drafting work—5 at \$4,500 each, 10 at \$3,500 each, 14 at \$3,000 each, 17 at \$2,500 each, to be appointed by the Secretary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the Acting Secretary of State appeared before the committee. He said that these men were compelled to draft papers, all kinds of papers that come before the State Department for consideration relative to our Diplomatic and Consular Service, and coming in contact with men in the chancelleries of Europe of long experience and high pay, men trained for that purpose; and he insisted that he could not get competent men to handle this branch of the service for less pay. Although he urgently requested an additional force to that which we have granted, we finally came to the conclusion that they were entitled to 10 men, especially under existing circumstances. Although the war is over and direct war expenditures are being cut down, the Senator must bear in mind that with the conclusion of the war, the organization of new nations, the thousand and one questions that must arise between our allies and the countries with which we have been at war during the past few years, the labors of the State Department have enormously increased.

I can not go into all the details in reference to that, because they have not been given to me, but it is apparent that that condition exists. These additional clerks, the only change we have made there, have been estimated for, and the department has estimated for a considerably increased force more than that; so I think that under existing circumstances their request should be allowed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 35, line 8, after the words "Under Secretary," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,500"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$529,840" and insert "\$565,340," so as to read:

private secretary to the Under Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$1,800; clerks—27 of class 4, 30 of class 3, 40 of class 2, 63 of class 1 (3 of whom shall be telegraph operators), 40 at \$1,000 each, 10 at \$900 each; lithographer, \$1,400; chief messenger, \$1,000; 8 messengers; 27 assistant messengers; 4 messenger boys at \$420 each; packer, \$720; 7 laborers; 4 telephone switchboard operators; chauffeur, \$1,080; 10 charwomen; in all, \$565,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the words "Department of State," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$200,000"; in line 21, after the word "That," to strike out "no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless"; and in line 26, after the word "positions," to strike out "appropriated for herein," so as to make the clause read:

For temporary employees in the Department of State, \$200,000: *Provided*, That not more than eight persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum: *Provided*, That all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany

shall be reinstated on application to their former positions if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if there ought not to be a limitation as to the maximum amount which may be paid to any employee out of the \$200,000 additional appropriation provided for in the paragraph now under consideration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was interrupted, Mr. President, and did not catch the paragraph to which the Senator refers. I shall be glad if he will call my attention to it.

Mr. KING. On page 35, lines 19, 20, and 21, there is a provision that—

not more than eight persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

Is there any limitation upon the amount which may be paid those eight persons? Could they not be paid \$10,000 each?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I think they could; but I think it is proposed to pay these men somewhere in the neighborhood of \$5,000. It is impossible, however, to put a maximum limitation on it; and, of course, the limitation in the paragraph is in the total expenditure. To accomplish the result referred to, if the State Department went out and deliberately paid \$10,000 each to eight men, it would so consume the bulk of the appropriation that it could not function very well.

Mr. KING. Obviously, that is true; but I thought perhaps the department had in mind the character of the work which was to be performed and the personnel that would be employed under this provision.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They have, and they had a hearing before the committee; and my recollection is that they stated that they expected to get these men at salaries ranging from four to five thousand dollars.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator advise us what the duties of these positions are that call for salaries which are in excess of that allowed; for instance, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and many of the very important officials of the Government?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They would not be in excess of that. I do not remember about the Interior Department, but my recollection is that the Assistant Secretary of State gets \$7,500.

Mr. KING. I had reference to some other departments, where the assistant secretaries receive very small compensation. For instance, the Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior receives only \$2,750.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The position of assistant sometimes is a very important position and sometimes it is merely a clerical position. These temporary employees of the State Department have been working out—the work was organized before the war, but it has largely increased since the war—definite information in regard to our trade and contact in a commercial way with the foreign nations. They have a very complete bureau organized; and my recollection is that the testimony showed that the President, out of the fund provided to him for emergencies, largely increased the appropriation last year for this specific work, because of the urgent need of the information coming to the department. It was for that reason that after consideration we increased the appropriation, not to the full extent the department asked, but we gave them an increase of \$75,000.

Mr. KING. There is an appropriation of \$200,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But this is not in excess of what they had last year. The House held the appropriation down to \$125,000. The Senate increased it \$75,000, but after going into it carefully and after a full hearing on the subject.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not there is any duplication between the work contemplated to be performed by the employees provided for in the paragraph under discussion, and that performed by employees of the Commerce Department?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My recollection is that the State Department claims that there is not; but my own judgment is that there must of necessity be some duplication, though it is not direct duplication.

Mr. KING. I want to say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, that complaints have been made to me that there has been, and still is, a great deal of duplication between work performed by men operating under the control of the State Department and those who are operating under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, as long as we keep the Consular Service in the State Department and then try to have the Department of Commerce function along commercial lines, I do not see how you are going to prevent certain classes of duplication, because both are working along the same line. I want to say further, however, that probably in the past the commerce of our country has suffered—I do not mean in the immediate

past, but before some organization was created, both in the State Department and in the Department of Commerce, looking to the expansion of our foreign trade, and to obtaining information for the great business interests of the country that are looking to foreign trade. I do not think there was any condition in the whole governmental machinery that needed readjustment more than this does. We sat down and complained that our neighbors, foreign nations, advanced their foreign trade to a far greater extent than American trade; and in the end we find that so far as our Government was concerned, except in the recent past, along certain lines there were no facilities granted to our citizens for the expansion of trade.

It is true that we had a Consular Service; but until recently the Consular Service was not expected to function along these lines or to keep in constant contact with foreign trade. I know that there were some consular offices that furnished very remarkable reports in the past. On the other hand, many of them accomplished nothing more than drawing their salaries. It has only been within the last decade that any real effort has been made to establish American banks in foreign countries; it has only been within the last decade that any effort has been made to increase our merchant marine; and I can practically say the same thing in reference to the work of our Consular and Diplomatic Service along the line of investigating the fields of commerce in foreign countries and advising the American producer and the American manufacturer as to his opportunities to do business abroad.

We may not be developing along any one of these three lines as rapidly as we ought to; but unless we can have banks in foreign countries, unless we can have a merchant marine that is commanded by ourselves and not by our trade adversaries, and unless we can have men trained in commercial lines, men of ability, men of experience, who can investigate the foreign trade field and report back to the manufacturer and producer in America as to what opportunities he may find abroad and assist him in finding them, our foreign commerce will not expand; and along certain lines it must expand, or we will have idle factories and idle furnaces in the near future.

Take the iron and steel industry. Everyone knows that the expansion of the iron and steel industry in America has far exceeded the American demand. Take the cotton industry. The cotton industry must find foreign fields, or it will have surplus cotton upon its hands that it can not dispose of in America. The appropriation of which the Senator speaks, and other appropriations along that line, are for the purpose of helping a development in that foreign field. As to how far it is accomplishing the result, I can not say. I know it has done some good. As to whether it has produced all the good and efficient results that should be produced in order to warrant the expenditure of the money, I can not say; but I think it would be very unwise for the Congress to cut down the effort in that direction to expand our foreign commerce.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hope the Senator does not misapprehend the inquiry which I made, or at least the object and purpose of it. I agree most heartily with what the Senator has said; and while perhaps I may be regarded as a good deal of a crank upon appropriations and my appeals here for economy may have produced some irritation, I do plead guilty to a desire to be liberal and generous with appropriations for the purpose of extending our foreign trade and commerce.

What I inquired of the Senator about was this: In the investigations which I have made I have discovered that there has been considerable duplication; that the Commerce Department and the State Department have been running along, in some instances, on parallel lines; and frequently those lines would merge together and confusion would result. I think there ought to be more coordination. I do not venture an opinion as to whether or not the appropriations for the extension of our foreign trade, for obtaining information necessary to enable us to extend our trade and commerce, ought to be under the State Department or under the Department of Commerce; but certainly it is manifest to anyone who thinks for a moment that it is unwise to have a duplication of work, to have two departments that are running along parallel lines. There ought to be coordination; and the complaints that have been made to me, and the investigations which I have made, confirm the view that there has been too much of duplication between the two departments.

It is obvious, in view of the efforts which are being made by Germany, or will be made by Germany, and which are now being made by Great Britain and France and other nations, that there will be great rivalry for the trade of the world. If the American people do not exert themselves, and, indeed, assert themselves, they are going to lose much of the trade that they have had in the past, and they will fail to gain much that they

might obtain in the future. We ought to take lessons from the work of Germany in the past in the extension of her trade and commerce; and I would be willing to have very liberal appropriations made in order to develop our trade and commerce, and to bring us into contact with those nations of the world that will need the products of mine and field and farm in this country.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, last year there was an appropriation of \$200,000 for temporary employees in the Department of State. This year there was an estimate sent in for \$500,000. The House granted \$125,000. The Senate amended that by striking out \$125,000 and inserting \$200,000. These are not all the temporary employees that the State Department wants, by any manner of means, nor do I think these employees will be used for the purpose stated by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I had a confidential paper that I showed to the Senator which was sent to us, and that part of them will be used along the line I indicated, as shown in that paper.

Mr. SMOOT. I have the number, and I can state to the Senator just the number, if necessary; but not many of them will be paid from this fund. I am safe in saying, however, that if this amount of \$200,000 is not sufficient, the State Department will go this year to the same fund to which they went last year, and secure money in order to hire the number of employees they want.

I think the Senate ought to know that the different departments of our Government made certain representations to Congress last year for appropriations, and Congress refused to give what was asked; but it develops now that where a refusal was made they went to the President of the United States, and asked him to give them money out of the fund that was given him as a confidential fund, and secured appropriations for the purpose of running the different departments of the Government. I know that that has happened, not only in the State Department, but in the Department of Justice, in the Department of Commerce, in the Bureau of Naturalization, and in the Department of Labor. I requested the other day that there be sent to the committee a list of all of the appropriations made from the fund of the President, showing to what departments it had been given, and the amount. Up to the present time it has been passed on from one to another, and I have come to the conclusion that we are not going to get the information. I do not know that it would do any good if we had the information; but I wanted to know how much further this thing could be carried on, and how much there was left in the fund, so that we could arrange our appropriations accordingly.

I do not think that is the proper thing to do. I think all the money that is appropriated for the departments of this Government ought to be appropriated in the regular appropriation bills, and I think the Congress ought to know the amount that is appropriated. They are responsible for the maintenance of the departments as far as appropriations are concerned, and I believe that whenever a representation is made by the head of a department, and then Congress refuses to make an appropriation for it, there ought to be no other place where they could go and secure the money to carry on what they thought they ought to have.

Mr. President, I believe that this item of \$200,000 is really necessary. I voted for this increase, and I simply wanted to say what I have said so that Congress may know what has taken place in the past. I can not say how much it has been. I know that the testimony showed that in the Department of Commerce, in one particular instance, there was \$100,000, and in the Bureau of Naturalization there was \$100,000, and in some of the other departments there was even more, and even in the Child Labor Bureau—although this fund of \$100,000,000 was given for war purposes—there has been an increase; I do not know how much. I have been unable to learn. In the home gardening there was also an appropriation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator whether it would not be a very wise and prudent thing to offer an amendment to this bill that no amount whatever shall be received or expended by the department other than that which is appropriated in this bill? And would it not be a wise idea to pass a Federal statute making it an offense or prohibiting the reception of money from some other fund not contemplated when the appropriation was made and expending it in a department or in a bureau for which an appropriation was made after due consideration by Congress?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that there is a statute already preventing any department of our Government from creating a deficit, and yet there is not a department of the Government but that does it every year, and sometimes the

deficit is greater than the original appropriation; and as long as Congress recognizes this violation of the statute and pays no particular attention to it, it is going on. It will never cease.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rose merely to ask a question of the Senator from Utah, but I will ask it of the Senator from Alabama. In response to a question put by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], I think the Senator from Alabama stated that the \$200,000 for which there is no specification was to be used for the expansion of our foreign trade.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In part.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know for what else it may be used, but that seems to be its chief purpose. The Department of State has its consular agents. They may be effective; they may be ineffective; but two or three years ago we adopted the policy of doing through the Department of Commerce this work that was not fully done through the consular agents. That was our policy, deliberately adopted.

I find, turning to the appropriations made for the Department of Commerce, that the appropriations for the identical purpose amounted in the aggregate to \$690,000. I find that there is a lump appropriation of \$325,000, which may be expended for any purpose in connection with the promotion of the commercial interest of the United States. Then, there is an appropriation of \$100,000, made with the especial object of increasing our trade with South and Central America; an appropriation of \$100,000 for the development of our commerce in the Orient; and an appropriation of \$165,000, which is again entirely indefinite, and may be applied, I presume, to the whole field.

Is there any showing before the Committee on Appropriations that we need more than \$690,000 for the maintenance in these various portions of the earth of a sufficient force to keep us well advised with regard to commerce and the opportunities which may exist for American business men to enlarge or increase their trade abroad? I can not, for the life of me, understand how they could spend more than \$690,000 for such a purpose, and spend it economically and wisely. I am inclined to think that \$200,000 is just thrown away and will serve no useful purpose if it is intended simply to get reports with regard to our foreign commerce.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to go into the matter fully, Mr. President, but I have no doubt that, with the information the Senator from Iowa has, he is perfectly sincere in making his statement, and yet I do not believe that we could get along without a reasonable amount of this work being done. I will say that right at this hour I am not fully informed as to the individual work these agents in the Commerce Department have been doing, but that they have been doing a vast deal of work in investigating foreign trade, in publishing documents, which were brought to the attention of American manufacturers, indicating where the opportunities were for future development to take place, is undoubtedly true. On the other hand, I wish to say that our great foreign competitors in industrial lines are spending a great deal more money than we are along this line of development as a Government.

In reference to this particular \$200,000 the attention of the State Department last year was called to the strategic position of raw material as it affected war conditions, as to where raw material in various lines of industry relating to war and its work could be had, as to the channels of trade in which they were ordinarily moving, and as to the opportunities and necessities for diverting that raw material from our enemies. Having been called to the attention of our Government, it was necessary for them to make a very thorough investigation, which they did. That investigation has not fully been completed. So far as its functioning on the war side of the problem that probably is unnecessary, but so far as the peace aspect of that investigation is concerned it is just as important to-day as it was a year ago when it was begun.

I am sure it is not necessary for me to extend my remarks by amplifying the importance of our Government, and through our Government our business fabric, being informed as to where the raw materials of industry lie and in what channels of the trade they move. That is one of the things being worked out by this appropriation.

There is another proposition of great importance that was before the State Department, and that is the collective buying for foreign nations. Most of the principal European nations have arranged for collective action by their buyers or importers, each individual line of trade to supersede the competitive purchasing formerly practiced. This puts the American exporter at a fatal disadvantage. I am sure the Senator can realize that. In France a special system of consorting has been built up during the war, and in each line of trade a French comptoir purchases all goods imported into France, seriously affecting certain lines

of American trade. The foreign trade adviser's office have been forced to study the facts with regard to lines of trade involved in relation to efforts upon the national interests which would result from the making of forcible diplomatic representations to France along these lines. Actual trade figures are procured from the Department of Commerce, but they must be analyzed painstakingly by the same officers who have the current diplomatic situation in mind, namely, the officers of the Department of State.

Collective selling on the part of our foreign competitors is requiring organization in this country to meet conditions we have to meet in the competitive markets of the earth, and that can only be done through the diplomatic channel, with this specific information with reference to trade conditions brought to their attention.

I will state another question which the State Department has studied, and I am not going into details with reference to it, although I have the papers in my hand; but for certain reasons it may not be well to put them in the Record. It is the question of foreign governmental monopoly that is seriously affecting our trade, and is not merely a matter of commerce, to be treated along commercial lines; but as it is a governmental monopoly it must of necessity be treated through diplomatic channels. Those questions are being investigated. Part of this money has to be spent for that purpose. It is of great importance to our business interests that these questions should be understood and that our citizens should be advised how to meet them.

There is another question wherein this money has been spent in the past, and to some extent may be expended in the future. Growing out of the war it was necessary for our South American neighbors to make certain great foreign loans. The European trade markets were closed. The banking circles of Europe which had been supplying them with loans in the past were no longer able to do it, growing out of war conditions. They had to appeal to our country. It was a new line of business for our banking public. They required certain detailed information, and they had to acquire it through diplomatic channels. Part of this money was used in that line. I am not sure that it will be required in the future, but probably some of it will in the immediate future.

The international cable situation is another problem that has to be studied by the State Department. Part of the money in the past has been used for that purpose, and a reasonable amount of money provided in this bill will be used to study out the problems of the American control of the cable system. American-owned cable systems are at present vitally deficient from the standpoint of giving us independent communication with other countries. The Central and South American Telegraph Co. has asked the department's assistance with regard to extending its cable connections from Buenos Aires northward to Rio de Janeiro. Certain other interests are asking aid in the establishment of a system linking Cuba and Porto Rico to Key West. The Western Union Telegraph Co. is requesting aid to install a cable direct from New York to Rio de Janeiro.

In connection with these requests it now develops that no armored or deep-sea cable is manufactured in the United States and that we are dependent upon England for every foot of cable we may wish to lay. England has very naturally refused at this time to permit the sale of any of this cable to American interests. It is necessary to make certain investigations looking to the question of either securing the cable that we need to lay in the interest of our commerce or to advise American manufacturers upon what terms and conditions they can go into the manufacture of cables themselves.

These are some of the questions. There are a number of others I might go into. The committee has not ill-advisedly or without thought or consideration asked for this increased appropriation. I am thoroughly satisfied that if we have erred at all we have erred upon the side of economy, and that every dollar we have increased this appropriation should remain in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator is a little in error wherein he says that out of this \$200,000 those investigations shall be made. The investigations are to be made by the 10 employees, at \$2,500, for whom we have provided in the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is mistaken about that. I took this matter up personally with these gentlemen, besides doing so in the committee, and I can assure the Senator of the purpose. Of course, the work of these 10 employees may be along that line to some extent, but along this particular line the 10 employees could not cover it. I call the Senator's attention to this fact. He simply has not carefully looked at the papers in his hand. In this organization they have had, and

expect to continue, a divisional organization. Among others, there is Latin America, with a chief of division; a South American section with an assistant, and another assistant to cover the countries of Argentina, Paraguay, Brazil, and Uruguay; and a second assistant to cover Chile, Bolivia, and Ecuador. Then there is another division for the Caribbean section with an assistant, Colombia, Panama, Venezuela, Guiana, and Costa Rica are to have an assistant, with a second assistant under that division to Nicaragua, Guatemala, Salvador, and Honduras. Then there is another assistant to cover Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and the West Indies. There is another section, the Mexican section, with three assistants. Then there is the same kind of an organization for western Europe, with equally as large a number of employees; one for the Near East, another for the Far East; one for Russia; certain assistants in the foreign intelligence office, and certain other assistants for passport control, trade adviser, research and diplomatic lines. I will not take up the time of the Senate to read them all, but that is the line of organizations to carry out this work.

Mr. SMOOT. That organization is taken care of through appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service, I will say to the Senator, and of this \$200,000 that is here for temporary employees of the State Department some may be used, of course, for this purpose, but the reason given why they wanted the 10 employees extra above what the House allowed them was that these were the special employees who were desired to make an investigation of the radio system.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not like to dispute the question with the Senator, but the Senator is misinformed. I know what I am talking about. The papers that I hold in my hand were brought to my desk by the gentlemen interested in this request for an increased appropriation, and I know; I am not guessing at it; I am not misinformed about it. I have made the statement, based upon information that was furnished me by the men at the head of this proposition. Their work was largely done on an appropriation given them by the President from his special fund last year, and when they asked for this increase and asked for more than we had given them they brought these papers to me that I hold in my hand, from which I made the statement, for the purpose of obtaining this specific appropriation. So there is no doubt about it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I accept implicitly the statement made by the Senator from Alabama; I think it is correct; but the argument founded upon it, so far as this appropriation is concerned, is very fallacious. I am not speaking about what the State Department ought to have to carry on its diplomatic affairs. I assume that the real function of the State Department is to deal with foreign Governments in some way or other.

If our appropriation for the office of the State Department is not sufficient to enable it to employ the proper number and kind of persons to carry on its correspondence and its intercourse with foreign countries, I, for one, am very willing to increase that number; but we are in very great danger of injuring rather than assisting our foreign trade, in a proper sense of that word, by the complications which may arise between the State Department and the Department of Commerce with regard to business.

I will say, as I said before, in my opinion the State Department ought to have nothing to do with business except as it merges itself into our relations with foreign Governments. The Senator from Alabama says that we ought to have some way of meeting foreign competition, as in collective buying and collective selling.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said to get the information by which we could know what we are doing. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Congress of the United States has acted upon that matter. It has passed a law which has for its especial purpose the consolidation and combination which in the judgment of Congress was thought necessary to enable that competition to be met in a successful way. The administration, so far as it is to be administered, of that law, is committed to the Federal Trade Commission, not to the Department of State.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I think he is making a mistake in that proposition. It was before I came to the Senate and when I was a Representative in another body that the matter came to my attention. There was an effort made by the House within my recollection to cut out of the State Department this entire organization in reference to foreign commerce, limiting it to the functions of the Department of Commerce. My recollection is that under that House amendment the opposition to it came from the Senate. I recall now having talked the matter over with one or two distinguished Senators at that time whose names I do not care to call, and the two organizations were kept in the bill

due to the opposition in the Senate. They have been there all the time.

Of course, I am free to say that growing out of the war conditions the functions of this bureau in the State Department were vastly increased; but the germ was there, and as long as it is the policy of the Government and the law that we shall maintain these organizations in both departments, the committee carrying appropriations for the supply of sufficient money to function on is not here to determine what shall be the policy of the Government when you fixed that by statutory law. Of course, we may have some limitation in determining how far they shall function and how far they shall draw in by either extending or limiting their appropriation, but the policy has already been fixed by the Government and it is a governmental policy now.

Mr. CUMMINS. The policy has never been established except through appropriations, and it is to be continued through appropriations. This is the time and this is the place to change the policy if we desire to have it changed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, I agree with him that usually the extent of the functions, and to some extent the functions themselves, have been established by appropriation bills. But the Senator calls my attention to the fact, and it is a fact, that the Congress itself by a statutory law established this bureau in the Department of Commerce in relation to our foreign-trade matters, not by an appropriation bill but by law itself, in establishing that bureau, a brand new bureau, within the last decade.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Up to that time these functions had been entirely occupied by the Department of State. When Congress performed that legislative act it did not cut off those functions, it left them to survive, and they are right at the present time performing a most valuable and a most necessary function for the benefit of American business.

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as its value in time of war, I express no opinion, for I am not familiar with what it has done during the war, and I am very willing, indeed I would be anxious, to continue every appropriate intervention on the part of our Government, not in private business but so far as private business required us to deal with a foreign government. But beyond that I do not think the State Department ought to go. That is a view which I have held for a long time, and I have tried to express it whenever the opportunity or occasion presents itself.

I know the futility of opposing this appropriation, and I am simply recording my own opinion with regard to it, that in so far as this appropriation is used to expand our business, to secure for the people of this country more foreign trade, it will be either a purely duplicated service or it will be of no value whatsoever. That is not saying that the suggestions of the Senator from Alabama are not well founded with regard to those cases in which we must deal as a Nation with foreign powers. I want that power fully sustained, and I want it amply sustained, but I have had rather a close observation of the workings of the Department of Commerce with regard to our foreign trade. I think the work of that department has been exceedingly valuable. I think it has covered the whole field. It does not confine itself to work in the United States, to the translation of foreign documents that may give information about trade. The employees of the Department of Commerce travel all over the world making a personal investigation at every point at which it is possible or thought possible that commerce may be enlarged. I do not know that all the reports are published, but they are very generally published, and they contain information of the most valuable character. They maintain just such a bureau of information as was suggested by the Senator from Alabama, namely, when they see an opportunity in some foreign country for an American business man to sell goods or engage there in business of his own they promptly make it known and get in correspondence with those who are likely to embrace an opportunity of that kind.

I do not disparage that kind of work. I think it is exceedingly helpful and ought to be continued, but I think that when we try to duplicate it in so far as it is duplicated—I have no expert knowledge upon that subject and I do not know what the State Department is doing—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said to the Senator candidly that I thought there was duplication there, although it is claimed there is not; but I am not prepared to say how far it is duplicated.

Mr. CUMMINS. What I would like to do, and I hope it may be done, because I do not expect to defeat this appropriation, is to call the attention of the Senate and the country and espe-

cially of the Committee on Appropriations to this view, that in the future the work of the State Department ought to be limited, no matter how much it costs, to our diplomatic intercourse with foreign nations and our ordinary Consular Service which is of a commercial character, but it is not particularly intended to extend or increase our foreign commerce.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I do not quite understand just where the line should be drawn as to the activities of the consular and diplomatic representatives. If a consular agent is in a section of the world where there is business and where there is an opportunity for the expansion of American trade and commerce, and if he is charged with the responsibility of obtaining figures as to the trade and commerce of that particular section, I can not just see why he ought not to aid in a legitimate way American manufacturers who seek to vend their wares in the district in which he is located.

Mr. CUMMINS. Undoubtedly such a consular agent should do that, and unquestionably many of them do that, but that is not the primary purpose of appointing consular agents; it is secondary. Many of them are skillful in that direction and make valuable reports, of which the business men of the United States have sought to take advantage, and do take advantage, but in so far as the consular agent can perform this work it ought to be continued by the consular agent, and there is ample appropriation in the bill for the continuance of the consular agent and for his work. I am only speaking of that special, that extraordinary work, which seems in a sense to be a direct subsidy to private business that is performed by the Department of Commerce and that is to be performed again under this appropriation by the Department of State by an investigator who goes all over the world, who studies the subject, and who reaches a conclusion with regard to what can be done by American men of business and how they must go about doing it.

There was a time when that was not considered a part of the public business, and a good many of us were rather reluctant to see the Government go into the subsidizing policy; but we have gone into it so largely and so generously that I am perfectly willing to see it continued, for I really think it can accomplish some good. The Government of the United States is doing for a great many people precisely what our great corporations do for themselves. There is no department of the Government, either in the office of the Secretary of State or in the office of the Secretary of Commerce, that approaches in point of ability, in point of comprehensiveness, the efficiency attained by the United States Steel Corporation and its various organizations, which maintains a bureau of this kind, and its agents are in every part of the world for the sole purpose of helping the sale of steel products abroad.

I was formerly of the opinion that that kind of work could be well left to the individual initiative and enterprise of business men, but the gradual drift toward governmental function has led me at least to tolerate the assumption of that work upon the part of the Government. I am very frank in saying that I believe the present Department of Commerce has done wonderfully well in exploiting our opportunities abroad. It was under the influence of that department that Congress passed the law which to some extent mitigated the rigidity or the severity of the antitrust law, and permits, under certain circumstances, combinations among our business men for foreign trade.

What I am objecting to is that we are spending all the money that can be profitably spent through the Department of Commerce in uncovering the opportunities which may exist and in tendering to our business men the suggestions which may arise from investigation. What the State Department spends in that particular of the \$200,000 here appropriated, in my judgment, is just so much absolutely wasted. That is not saying that in these matters concerning ocean cables and other things that require diplomatic intervention between two governments the State Department is sufficiently equipped; but if it is not it ought to come frankly forward and secure appropriations for the maintenance of employees who are to do that work. It ought not to come and secure an appropriation the expenditure of which is not in any way directed by Congress, leaving the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to explain how it will be spent, but without binding in any way the State Department to expend the money for that purpose or in that way. It is precisely like all these lump-sum appropriations.

The great scandal of the work of Congress is the lump-sum appropriation, where we give general authority to withdraw money from the Treasury without indicating by whom it shall be spent or for what it shall be spent or even what shall be accomplished by the expenditure. We shall never resume—I will not say "resume," for I do not know that we have ever occu-

pled the right position with regard to that matter—but we shall never even approach our much-desired economy in public affairs until Congress does direct the purposes for which money shall be spent.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am very glad to hear the Senator make those remarks. I wish more Senators would study this question and make similar remarks about this matter. We had before the war came on about gotten rid of lump-sum appropriations. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and I have been fighting lump-sum appropriations for years and years. We hoped to get rid of them, and we had about done so when the war came on, and now we have them galore. The object is to get rid of them, and I am glad to hear stated the position taken by the Senator from Iowa upon that question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have always taken that position, and I hope I may always be consistent enough to maintain it.

I should like to see an appropriation bill that would enable the Members of the Senate and the Members of the other House to exercise their own judgment with regard to the purpose for which money should be expended and with regard to the amount that should be expended for such a purpose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this bill itself is trying to remedy that evil. It is practically impossible for an appropriation committee, when it has before it a bill embracing a large field of expenditure which requires the organization of bureaus and divisions of the Government, to sit down at the time of the organization and work out how many chiefs of bureaus or divisions or clerks are needed. But we have provided in this bill for a commission, to be composed of Members of the two Houses of Congress, to work out a reclassification of all salaries. That is the only way it can be done. It is impossible to do it on an appropriation bill. A reorganization may grow out of the work of this commission that will accomplish the result to which the Senator from Iowa points, but it is the only way it can be done. If the Appropriations Committee had to sit down and study every detail in connection with every new bureau that is created under a lump-sum provision—how many clerks there should be of class 1 and class 2 and class 3, and how many chiefs of divisions there should be—we should never be able to report the appropriation bills within the long session, and certainly not within the short session of Congress.

Mr. CUMMINS. But, Mr. President, it would be possible even now in this appropriation bill to point out the purposes for which the money is to be expended, even if it could not be declared how many employees should be in a new bureau or what salaries they should receive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I spent about 20 minutes endeavoring to point out the purposes for which the appropriation was intended, and I am sorry the Senator from Iowa did not understand me.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood perfectly; the Senator from Alabama was exceedingly clear about that, but what the Senator has said does not bind the State Department in any particular.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course not, but nothing else would bind the State Department except the direct organization of these bureaus. As I say, it is impossible for us to do it in this way, but if the amendment to which I have referred in the last part of the bill is adopted we are going to give Congress a chance to appoint a commission to work out that very reform.

BOLSHEVIST PROPAGANDA IN WASHINGTON.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the Senate to an occurrence of yesterday, a comparatively full report of which appears in this morning's Washington Post, beginning on page 3, and continued on page 10. The headlines are:

Urge "red" America—Bolshevik speakers stir huge audience at Poll's Theater—City's radicals in throngs—Representative Mason charges plot to keep Slav funds in United States—Speaks from box after Albert Rhys Williams and others laud soviet and tell of spreading propaganda in United States—"Suff" pickets take up collections—Adopt Johnson resolution, now in Senate.

From this article, Mr. President, it appears that under the shadow of the Capitol and in the center of the Nation's activities a meeting largely attended was yesterday held which applauded propaganda hostile to the Constitution and institutions of the United States and addresses advocating the overthrow of both.

I am not permitted under the rules of the Senate to more than refer to the fact that a Member of the House figured conspicuously in this remarkable gathering. I may emphasize the

fact, however, that five of the suffragette pickets were in that audience, and one of them, Mrs. Ida M. Waters, assisted in taking up a collection to pay for the rent of the theater. Their presence was not surprising, for they seek notoriety wherever possible, and always clamoring for their rights under a Constitution they despise when corrected for their indiscretions.

Mr. President, for one I protest against assemblages which, under the guise of free speech, advocate what is virtually treason to the Nation. If I occupy a street corner and counsel my auditors to go to the White House and murder the President, or to the Willard Hotel and kill the proprietor, or to the Capital and murder a Senator or a Representative, the police very properly interfere, I am apprehended, and subjected to punishment; but if I counsel a campaign of universal murder and destruction, including the overthrow of the Government, I can rely upon my constitutional right to free speech and go unscathed.

I contend, Mr. President, that one is just as criminal as the other; and unless the people of this country—the plain, law-abiding, middle-class people—realize, and realize very soon, the fact that there is a conspiracy, usually secret, but frequently open, working for the overthrow of the Government of the United States and to erect upon its ruins a so-called government of murderers, anarchists, thieves, and criminals, with here and there some honest but deluded individual among them, the avalanche may be upon them in the near future. This is a serious situation. The people by and large should realize it and take the proper steps to protect themselves and their Government from sinister consequences.

I do not wish to indulge in undue forebodings; but when I realize that there is an organization in this country, as well as in others, comprised in small part, as all such organizations are, of good men and of good women and of good-meaning men and good-meaning women, but officered and controlled by criminals at heart and traitors in fact as well as in law, and that the movement of death and destruction which they preach and advocate is spreading, I want to be able to say hereafter that I did not remain silent when Bolshevik meetings are held within hailing distance of the Capitol.

I think it is safe to say that every murderer, every criminal, every man who hopes or expects to prosper or to benefit politically or materially, or both, by the overthrow of the social state by violence and massacre, by the ravishing of women and the destruction of property, by robbery, arson, and all the other social crimes known to the calendar, are enthusiastic members of this so-called organization. And now in the capital of the country this movement raises its voice, utters its treasons, counsels the overthrow of the Government, and lauds to the skies the substitution of social and political aggregations, the experiments in which in unhappy Russia have simply been appalling.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not wish to take more than a moment of the time of the Senate in relation to this increase from \$125,000 to \$200,000 and the purposes for which it was granted.

I have here a statement—I do not know whether or not it is the same statement referred to by the Senator from Alabama, but it is a confidential statement from the State Department. I have no right whatever to put it in the Record, nor do I believe that it would be a proper thing to do, for it has specific reference to certain work that would be undertaken in case the full \$500,000 were appropriated. Perhaps I may refer to some of the objects of investigation intended to be made by the representatives of the State Department in case the full appropriation asked for is made. I will call the attention of the Senate to a few of them, as follows: Foreign governmental monopolies; loans to Latin America; British trade aggression; foreign customs; difficulties of American exporters; Chinese railway and other loans; Japanese questions; and other loans to various countries. These questions were to be fully gone into by employees to be paid out of the appropriation under discussion. I think I am well within bounds when I state that the particular question referred to, namely, radio communication between North America and South America, requires special men to undertake the investigation, and we allowed 10 experts at \$3,500 each to assist in this work.

They asked for an increased number of drafting officers to aid in important drafting work and to act as chiefs of divisions or upon work connected with foreign relations. They

asked for 16 drafting officers at \$4,500, 25 at \$4,000, 32 at \$3,500, 20 at \$3,000, 15 at \$2,500. Of assistant solicitors they asked for 3 at \$3,500, 3 at \$3,000, 2 at \$2,500, and of law clerks they asked for 1 at \$2,500, 2 at \$2,250, and 3 at \$2,200. The House granted, of the drafting officers, 36 out of the 108 asked for; it granted 7 of the assistant solicitors, and 6 of the law clerks. Then they asked, Mr. President, for \$500,000 for temporary employees outside of those I have just mentioned.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us how many of those have been perpetuated in the bill or at least indorsed by the Senate committee?

Mr. SMOOT. Thirty-six of the drafting officers, 7 of the assistant solicitors, and 6 law clerks have been provided by the Senate committee; but the request was for 108 drafting officers, 8 assistant solicitors, and 6 law clerks, all of whom are to be located here in the District of Columbia. Every one wants our foreign commerce to increase and appropriates money for the purpose of assisting our manufacturers. Our manufacturers in this country may send samples of goods made for the American market and quote prices that perhaps would compete with the prices of other countries, but we are never going to sell goods in foreign lands to any extent until the goods are put up in the way the foreign countries want them. We can not convert them to our way of thinking as to the size of the packages or the manner in which they are to be distributed. They decide that question for themselves.

The reason Germany was so successful in the past in controlling the trade of South America and other countries of the world her commercial attachés went to the different countries, visited the merchants of those countries, and asked, "How do you want your goods put up? We will put them up in any way that you desire; we will place upon them any marks that you desire, or furnish you any colors your people wish." That done, it was easy for the German commercial attachés to secure orders from those countries. On the other hand, in the past we have gone to the foreign merchant, and said, "This is the way we make the goods, and this the way we pack them in the United States; they are to be shipped as we direct and the terms are as we dictate, and if you want to buy them on those terms and conditions well and good." All that has got to be changed before our commerce with foreign countries increases to any great extent, as we all hope it will.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to have passed over the provision that we are now considering. I desire to submit at least one, and possibly two amendments to it. I have not had opportunity to formulate them. The discussion has revealed to me a condition which I think calls for an amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, does not the Senator think we ought to have more Senators present when a matter of this importance is being considered? There are only a few Senators in the Chamber, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Calder	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Kellogg	New	Smoot
Colt	Kenyon	Nugent	Spencer
Curtis	King	Overman	Sterling
Dillingham	Kirby	Page	Swanson
Fernald	La Follette	Penrose	Thomas
Fletcher	Lenroot	Polindexter	Thompson
Hale	Lewis	Pollock	Trammell
Harding	Lodge	Pomerene	Underwood
Henderson	McKellar	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Hollis	McNary	Shafroth	Warren
Johnson, Cal.	Martin, Ky.	Sheppard	Wolcott
Jones, N. Mex.	Martin, Va.	Sherman	

Mr. McKELLAR. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] on official business.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily detained by illness.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] on official business.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on account of official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this morning, after the Senate had agreed to certain amendments to the provision as to clerical and other assistants to Senators—the provision which is found at the top of page 10 of the bill—it became necessary to change the amendment preceding that, found on pages 8 and 9 of the

bill, referring to the different committees named in that amendment. It was passed over, with the understanding that as soon as that amendment was finally perfected to conform to the amendment on page 10 a reconsideration of that amendment would be had.

I now move that the vote by which the amendment on pages 8 and 9 of the bill was adopted may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, as a substitute for the committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to substitute for the language proposed to be inserted by the committee the following:

Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Appropriations—clerk, \$5,000; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,500 each; three assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each; laborer, \$720. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,800; two assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Claims—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Commerce—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Conference minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500. District of Columbia—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Education and Labor—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Finance—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,600; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each; 2 experts (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$2,000 each. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Immigration—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Inter-oceanic Canals—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$2,500; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,800 each; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Judiciary—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,800 each; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Manufactures—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Military Affairs—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each; assistant clerk during the period of the war, \$1,500. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Pacific Islands and Porto Rico—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Pensions—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 4 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Philippines—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; 3 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Printing—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,600; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Public Lands—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Rules—clerk, \$2,720, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual, under the direction of the Committee on Rules; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500; in all, \$203,260.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that simply conforms to the action taken by the Senate in the case of the clerical and other assistants to Senators not holding chairmanships of other committees not enumerated in this bill; also to Senators who, when in the minority, are not entitled to a committee chairmanship, but are entitled to two clerks.

I think myself that the Senators are going to be criticized for these increases. I have already heard some rumblings of it in the hallways; but that is what was decided by the Senate, and as long as it has been decided, of course, this amendment ought to be agreed to, in order to conform to the action of the Senate shortly after 12 o'clock to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The Chair understands that this is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. As a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Utah for the committee amendment.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the adoption of the substitute in lieu of the House provision.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to move an amendment to make the Vice President's force conform to what has been done in reference to that of Senators. I ask consent to take up page 2, and move this amendment: On page 2, line 8, strike out the words "messenger, \$1,440," and make it read "clerk, \$1,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Also, strike out the word "telegraph," before the word "page," in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I understand, there was a request made by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], my colleague, to pass over the amendment on line 19, page 35.

Mr. KING. No, Mr. President. I did make such a request that it be passed over, and the acting chairman of the committee has assented to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair understand: Was the order that the entire paragraph be passed over?

Mr. KING. It is the entire paragraph for the reason that I want to submit two amendments to the paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the Senator desire to delay the adoption of this portion of the paragraph that relates to drafted men taking back their positions in the Government employ?

Mr. KING. Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then the Senator's request relates to the amendment in line 19?

Mr. KING. Yes; and then I shall offer a further amendment prohibiting the use by this department of money from any other source than that carried in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That can be done at any time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the request of the Senator relates only to the amendment on line 19?

Mr. KING. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that that has been declared, by a previous occupant of the chair, agreed to.

Mr. KING. If that was done, it was prematurely done.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Utah that if it has been agreed to, of course he will have an opportunity to ask for a vote in the Senate; but I will not raise an objection to it if he desires to call it up.

Mr. KING. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I should like the amendment to the other section of the paragraph to be passed over.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not understand that the next amendment has been disposed of, at lines 21 and 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it was declared agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I was about to leave the Senate Chamber, and I asked that that might be passed over until I returned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is here now.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to go on now; I only wanted to be heard in regard to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to its being taken up again.

Mr. LODGE. I was not aware that we had gone beyond the amendment in line 19.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator, in reference to that amendment, that the situation is this: The House inserted a proviso that came from the floor of the House, I understand, as follows:

Provided, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions appropriated for herein, if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

As the House provision stood, it limited that paragraph entirely to cases within this bill; and the very next bill that came to the Appropriations Committee had a similar provision. The committee did not see any reason why we should take this matter in detail and attempt to legislate in reference to each separate bill; but we thought it was wiser and better to make the provision apply to all of the employees of the Government who have left positions in the Government employ and gone to the front as soldiers, whether volunteers or drafted men, providing that the positions should be open to them when they came back. So, in order to accomplish that, we struck out certain words of the House provision and left it so that it will read as follows:

Provided, That all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

In other words, when they went to war, the statement was made to these young men by the heads of various executive bureaus that if they volunteered and went into the war their places would be kept open for them. It seems that there may have been one or two instances where some difficulties have arisen. So far as I am concerned, I think the Government should keep its pledge; that it owes it to these men who have left governmental positions, now that the war is over, when they come out of the Army to reinstate them. That is all that this provision carries. That is the purpose of it, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. LODGE. I am in sympathy with the provision, and I think that pledge ought to be kept; but striking out those words leaves it—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It makes it universal, instead of limiting it to this bill.

Mr. LODGE. I thought it was limited even more narrowly. Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no. The purpose of striking out these words is to make this clause universal and make it apply to the entire Federal service; and that is what ought to be done.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If you leave in those words you limit it merely to the clerks who are employed under the legislative bill. If you strike them out the provision will be applicable to all the clerks that are employed under the legislative bill, the sundry civil bill, the deficiency bill, and every other function of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is wise to make it universal in its application. My point is a slightly different one, and that is that under the House language the departments are compelled to take these soldiers back. If you leave that out, it seems to me to be left very much at the discretion of the department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This language is not changed in any way except the limitation that was put in here, probably on the part of whoever offered it in the House, to make the provision in order. The House provision was a limitation on the appropriation, on the expenditure of the money.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And unless it was done by unanimous consent, the proponent of the measure in the House could not have put it in this bill except by offering it in that form.

Mr. LODGE. No; I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee, though, makes it a universal law. I think that is all that is necessary. If the Senator desires to put more teeth in it, he can add a provision that any head of a department or other governmental officer who refuses to comply shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punished; but I do not think that will be necessary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I just want to suggest that if the language were left as the House put it, none of this money could be expended until they are sure that every soldier who will be discharged will be reinstated.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, that is very undesirable.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; as the Senator says, that would be undesirable.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the language of the bill as the Senate has it is mandatory, and that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it will be, and therefore the committee did not propose any punitive features to it.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator about its universal application. I think that ought to be. I only wanted to make sure that it would be carried out, and if the Senator thinks mandatory terms are sufficient I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I really do not think there will be much trouble in the executive departments anywhere; but a case might arise where, by reason of some employee being in, they would attempt to put the soldier somewhere else. With this provision in the bill, however, it is mandatory, and the Government head of a bureau or of a division or of a department can not refuse to reinstate the soldier if he is in such condition that he can do the work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the only fear I had in regard to this provision was that being a proviso it might apply only to the appropriation of the \$200,000. I think it would be very much safer to strike out the word "Provided" and make a new section of the wording as the committee reported it, and then there would be no question at all about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. LODGE. In that connection I want to say that when I read it first it seemed to me to apply only to the \$200,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the fear I have had all the time.

Mr. LODGE. And I think there is a possibility of doubt about that. I think it would be well if it could be placed somewhere else in the bill, so that it will be clearly applicable to all cases.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the word "Provided" be stricken out, and that a new paragraph be inserted at that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out the word "Provided" and the comma following and begin a new paragraph with the word "That."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment on lines 21 and 22 was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 36, line 3, after the word "act," to insert "except the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service," so as to make the clause read:

No money appropriated by any other act, except the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service, shall be used during the fiscal year 1920 for employment and payment of personal service in the Department of State in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 10, on page 40, the last paragraph read being as follows:

Arlington Building and annex, Vermont Avenue and H Street: For the following employees for the operation of the buildings: Assistant superintendent, \$2,000; chief engineer, \$1,400; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,200 each; 6 firemen; 13 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 2 oilers at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,400; 2 wiremen at \$1,200 each; plumber, \$1,200; plumbers' helper, \$1,000; painter, \$1,200; 2 carpenters, at \$1,200 each; janitor, \$1,200; assistant janitor, \$1,000; 25 male laborers, at \$660 each (4 to attend toilets and 2 to relieve elevator conductors when required); 3 female laborers, at \$660 each; captain of the watch, \$1,400; 3 lieutenants of the watch, at \$900 each; 26 watchmen; head of char force, \$840; 3 assistant heads of char force, at \$720 each; 190 charwomen; in all, \$122,980: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be used for the care, maintenance, and protection of the Arlington Building and annex only for housing the Bureau of War Risk Insurance: *Provided further*, That any space in said building and annex not needed for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance may be assigned by the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of other offices of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMOOT. I had not noticed that provision before, but if we adopt the amendment providing for a commission to look into the rent of the different buildings for the Government, will not this conflict with the authority provided for in that amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As far as I am concerned, though I can not speak for the committee, I am willing to have it go out. I think there is logic in what the Senator says in connection with it, and I am willing to have it go out.

Mr. SMOOT. And then go into conference?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And let it go to conference.

Mr. SMOOT. It does seem to me if the amendment found in the bill is passed it certainly will conflict with this provision.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand the Senator, we have a specific provision here for a legislative commission to assign space and room, and there is no reason why we should legislate on this subject if we are going to turn it over to the commission. I ask unanimous consent that the proviso be stricken out.

Mr. SMOOT. As long as it is going into conference, the best way would be to strike out both provisos after the numerals "\$122,980."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Because the first proviso states that this appropriation shall be used for the care, maintenance, and protection of the Arlington annex building only for housing the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. The commission may decide to put that bureau in an entirely different building.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think both provisos had best go out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to strike out the two provisos, beginning on page 40, line 3, down to and including line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama. I understand that the bill provides for an increase for the general employees of \$240 a year and for the War Risk Insurance Bureau employees of \$120. My question is, in what part of the bill is that provision?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In the very last part of the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. So that the question, whatever merit there may be in it, may be considered when we reach the last part of the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, yes. I will not stop now to explain it, but I shall be very glad, when we reach the proposition, to explain on what the action of the committee was founded.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," at the top of page 42, to strike out:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to enforce the provisions of the act of March 23, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 241), when instituting inquiry into the solvency of bonding companies doing business with the Government, \$5,000; the expense of each examination to be reimbursed by the bonding company examined.

The amendment was agreed to.

Number of regular employees, by salary grades and divisions, Jan. 15, 1919—Continued.

Salary grade.	Division.														Total.	Yearly salary account.
	Admin-istrative.	Allot-ment and allow-ance.	Claims and com-pensa-tion.	Malis and files.	Steno-graphic.	Legal.	Investi-gation.	Marine.	Sea-men's.	Audits and records.	Disburs-ing.	Insur-ance.	Actu-arial.	Medi-cal.		
\$792.....			1							1		2			4	\$3,168
\$780.....	9										5		1		15	11,700
\$760.....													1		1	760
\$720.....	6	5	3	1	1		1			2	3	5	8		35	25,200
\$660.....		1				1	1			1	203				207	136,620
\$600.....	4	1	1			4	1		1	2	1				15	9,000
\$480.....	38	75	16	1	1	2	5	1		21	45	13	4	1	223	107,040
\$360.....										1					1	360
\$312.....	226														226	70,512
Total.....	704	2,969	771	118	77	306	611	31	30	1,707	1,153	2,210	290	42	11,103	12,244,920

NOTE.—Average yearly salary, \$1,102.25.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that this lump sum is not abused like other lump-sum appropriations found in this and other bills. There are 5,335 employees of the War Risk Bureau whose salary grade is \$1,100. It costs the Government for that one grade of clerks alone \$5,868,500. That is a great part of the lump sum of \$9,000,000 appropriated.

All that the Senator from Massachusetts has said about lump-sum appropriations I fully indorse. I not only think it is a bad practice, but I think it is a wicked and extravagant practice. Before the war we had most of the lump-sum appropriations eliminated from our appropriation bills; but I am afraid it is going to take quite a number of years to get rid of them again. However, I do believe the commission which will be appointed if the House agrees to the Senate provision ought to begin immediately upon the work and force every bureau and every division and every department of the Government to inform the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate just how many clerks they want and just what salaries they are going to pay them.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator feels that way. It seems to me that it ought to be attended to and attended to at once, that they all ought to be eliminated from the law, and that wherever possible it ought to be done now.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I wish to occupy the time of the Senate for just a moment. It will be impossible to complete this bill to-night.

I have had called to my attention a matter dealing with a bureau of the Treasury Department, the War Risk Bureau, that I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate now because it may perhaps lead to a remedy of a situation existing there.

I have a letter from a soldier, or a man who was recently a soldier, living in New York City, who was discharged from the Army August 28. At the time of his enlistment he allotted \$15 of his pay to his wife. He had a minor child, and his wife's allotment therefore was \$40. It appears that regardless of the fact that he has been discharged from the Army his wife is still receiving the \$40 allotment. I have here the checks for September, October, November, December, and January, and I shall at the request of the soldier's family return the checks to the Treasury Department and urge that hereafter greater care be taken in paying these allotments months after a soldier has actually left the Army.

Differing from this situation, I have a letter here from a citizen of the city of New York. This lady writes me:

Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am the mother of Arthur Sweetbaum, a private in Company G, Fourth United States Infantry. He was wounded in action on October 7, 1918, and was treated in various hospitals in France until he finally arrived in Convalescent Hospital No. 5.

On December 10, 1918, he was sent to St. Nazaire, preparatory to shipment home. This morning we received a letter from him, stating that the records in his case have either been lost or mislaid, and that he has no idea when he will get home, in spite of the fact that he is still suffering from the wound he received in his arm. This is not an isolated case, as you will find upon investigation that there are about 2,000 similar cases at St. Nazaire—that is, of cases where no records can be located. He has not been paid any money by the Government for services abroad for the past seven months—

Mr. President, in one case we find a wounded soldier without pay for seven months, and in another we find the wife of a soldier who has been out of the Army for five months receiving her allotment of \$40 every month, despite the fact that her husband is not now in the service—

He had collected some souvenirs while at the front, and he was compelled to dispose of them in order to secure a few cents for himself. The Christmas package and numerous other packages and letters sent to him have never reached him. Why, even a United States money order did not reach him. We are having returned to us letters that we sent to him in September, 1918, with the indorsement that he was wounded. In this morning's letter he states, "For God's sake, don't send me anything here, as I don't receive a thing."

I emphasize the above, as I have just received (at 6.30 p. m.) another letter sent to my son by a friend of his, and dated September 30, 1918, and also indorsed "Wounded 5/11/18 C. P. O. Tours."

The thorough incompetence of some officials in the War Department is enough to drive one insane. It appears that once a man is wounded he loses all rights; he is left to shift for himself; he is hemmed in with a lot of red tape, and no attempt is made to get him his salary or mail.

In the name of a native-born American, wounded in action in defense of his country's honor, I appeal to you to help me get my son back to the United States.

I assure you that I will greatly appreciate anything you will do for me. Thanking you in advance, I am,
Yours, truly,

(Mrs.) GUSSIE SWEETBAUM.

Mr. President, it is not my custom to bring matters of this kind to the attention of the Senate; I usually take them up with the War Department in an effort to have them straightened out there; but the fact that such gross neglect can exist, that the families of some soldiers receive their allotments after the soldiers have left the service, while in other cases soldiers wounded in action can not be sent home because their papers have been mislaid and can not get their pay for seven months warrants me in bringing up the subject here, in the hope that men will not be paid after they have left the service and that men will be paid who have been wounded in action.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 4, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1919.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Jouett Shouse, of Kinsley, Kans., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

John Skelton Williams, of Richmond, Va., to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.)

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Frederick M. Hedger, of Washington, to be register of the land office at Walla Walla, Wash., his present term expiring December 30, 1918. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY.

Second Lieut. James Coachman Cullens, jr., Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Cavalry from November 1, 1918.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Vincent John Conrad, Cavalry, to be second lieutenant of Infantry from November 1, 1918.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1919.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

Clarence D. Maxey, Backus.
Milton P. Mann, Worthington.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Sarah A. Lunceford, Smithfield.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James A. Cooper, Brockwayville.
Blair Rorabaugh, Clymer.
William D. First, Conneaut Lake.
Thomas F. McHale, Olyphant.

UTAH.

Charlotte H. Nelson, Castlegate.
Thomas Brimley, Farmington.
Clyde Panter, Magna.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, February 3, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Oh Thou, who art from everlasting to everlasting, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, help us to subject ourselves to Thy will, since Thy laws are inexorable. It is writ: Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.

May we sow good seeds, that our harvest may be abundant in the Spirit. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, February 1, and Sunday, February 2, were read and approved.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues, Mr. KNUTSON and Mr. POWERS, of the Committee on Immigration, be allowed to file minority views during to-day on the bill H. R. 15302 in the nature of a dissent from the four-year proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that his colleagues, Mr. KNUTSON and Mr. POWERS, be allowed to file minority views during the day on the bill H. R. 15302, the immigration bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 5279. An act to authorize the resumption of voluntary enlistment in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate assembles as a mark of respect to the memory of Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky, in pursuance of an order heretofore made, to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Senate again expresses its profound sorrow at the death of the late Senator from Kentucky.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate assembles as a mark of respect to the memory of Hon. WILLIAM JOEL STONE, late a Senator from the State of Missouri, in pursuance of an order heretofore made, to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Senate again expresses its profound sorrow at the death of the late Senator from Missouri.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8828. An act increasing the limit of cost for the acquisition of a public-building site at Yonkers, N. Y.

EDITORIAL IN WASHINGTON POST.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks to have read an editorial in this morning's Post. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER and Mr. WALSH objected.

Mr. SIEGEL. I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point that no quorum is present, and the Chair will count.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House, I withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair was waiting for. [Laughter.]

MILITARY ACADEMY BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15462, the Military Academy bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the House that two hours is set aside to-day for the consideration of the Military Academy bill.

Mr. GARNER. From this moment?

Mr. MANN. No; from the meeting of the House.

Mr. GARNER. From the time that we go into Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole can decide that. [Laughter.]

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SABATH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fifteen enlisted musicians, at \$51 each per month, \$9,180.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask that the Clerk read an important editorial in this morning's Washington Post in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPLANATIONS IN ORDER.

There are a lot of things that happened in this war which remain to be explained. Perhaps we shall have to wait until the peace treaty is signed and the whole business closed up formally, but eventually they will have to be explained. The public will insistently demand an explanation, and the returning soldiers will see to it that this demand is complied with.

Is it true that Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, who worked out the selective-service plan and successfully executed it, was reprimanded by Gen. March, Chief of Staff, for giving his views to a congressional committee? It has been so reported, and the report even goes so far as to aver that the reprimand has been written into Gen. Crowder's Army record. Nothing official has been announced about it, and Gen. Crowder, being a true soldier, has kept his lips sealed. The people would like to know the truth about it.

Why was Gen. W. L. Sibert, who commanded the first contingent of the American Army sent abroad, relieved of his command and sent home before our forces became involved in the fighting? Gen. Sibert was picked to lead the advance guard of the Yanks. He put them through their training period in France, and there was every reason to expect that he would command the first American Army of the expeditionary forces, with the rank of lieutenant general. Suddenly it was learned that he was on his way back, and upon reaching the United States he was given charge of the Chemical Warfare Service, a highly important assignment, but far from the ultimate goal of a soldier's ambition. Sibert, being a true soldier, has kept silent, but the public would like to know why he was sent back.

Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards went to France in command of the Twenty-sixth Division, composed of the New England National Guard. He led his troops through the hard fighting along the Meuse, where they sustained heavy losses, but made a splendid record, which added luster to the fame of the American forces. Suddenly, and without apparent reason, Gen. Edwards was relieved of his command and sent back to the United States. No reason has been given, and Gen. Edwards, being a true soldier has said nothing. The people are curious to know why.

It has been charged upon the floor of the Senate that replacements in the Twenty-eighth Division, composed of the Pennsylvania National Guard, were made from men who had had no training, many of them never even having fired a rifle. This division sustained heavy losses in the Argonne fight, the untrained soldiers being mowed down by the hundreds. Returning officers of the division corroborate the charge. Is it true? And if so, who was to blame for it?

Responsible officers assert that the Thirty-fifth Division, composed of the National Guard of Missouri and Kansas, after six days of continuous, grueling fighting in the Argonne Forest, tottered back to the rest billets, completely exhausted, to be met by an inspection officer, who